DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 206 840 CE 029 925

AUTHOR	Tallmadge, G. Kasten; And Others
TITLE	Study of the Career Intern Program. Summary Report.
INSTITUTION	RMC Research Corp., Mountain View, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	RMC-UR-481
PUB DATE	May 81
CONTRACT	400-78-0021
NOTE	104p.; For related documents see CE 029 926-930 and TM 810 654.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Career Education; Cost Effectiveness; Counseling Services; Dropout Prevention; *Dropouts; *Economically Disadvantaged; Education Work Relationship; Experiential Learning; *Field Experience Programs; High School Equivalency Programs; *High School Students; *Nontraditional Education; Outcomes of Education; Potential Dropouts; Program Costs; Program Descriptions; Program Development; *Program Effectiveness; Secondary Education; Success
IDENTIFIERS	*Career Intern Program

ABSTRACT

The Career Intern Program (CIP) is an alternative high school designed to enable disadvantaged and alienated dropouts or potential dropouts to earn regular high school diplomas, to prepare them for meaningful employment or postsecondary education, and to facilitate their transition from school to work. CIP components are instruction, counseling, hands-on career exposure, diagnosis/assessment, and climate. While CIP sites were, at times, plagued by such problems as low morale and poor attendance, evaluation of the actual implementation of CIP at four sites, assessment of the impact of CIP on participating interns, analysis of factors related to CIP's success, and examination of the effectiveness of CIP as opposed to other programs for the disadvantaged dropout indicate that CIP has been quite effective in meeting its objectives and that it can be successfully replicated in new sites. Recommendations for improving CIP's design included increasing staff salary scales to decrease the high staff turnover rate, modifying the summer program to allow students more time for gainful employment and to alleviate transportation problems, and developing sanctions for unexcused absences. (Related reports devoted to CIP implementation, costs, structure, and outcomes and a comparison of CIP with similar youth programs are available separately through ERIC--see note.) (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED206840

CE 029 925

RMC Report No. UR 481

SUMMARY REPORT

STUDY OF THE CAREER INTERN PROGRAM

G. Kasten Tallmadge
Peter G. Treadway
David M. Fetterman

May 1981

Prepared for the
National Institute of Education

RMC Research Corporation
Mountain View, California

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to Contract No. 400-78-0021 with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Institute position or policy, and no official endorsement by the sponsor should be inferred.

3

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES iv

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS v

FOREWORD vi

I. Introduction 1

II. CIP Description 5

III. Site Case Histories 13

IV. Impact of the CIP on Participating Interns 47

V. Factors Related to Success 59

VI. Answers to the Research Questions 71

VII. Summary and Conclusions 91

References 95

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Treatment Group Pre-to-Postest NCE Gains in Reading: Estimates Derived from Norm-Referenced Analyses . . . 50

Table 2. Treatment Group Pre-to-Posttest NCE Gains in Math: Estimates Derived from Norm-Referenced Analyses . . . 52

Table 3. High School Status of Members of the Treated, Untreated, and Control Groups 55

Table 4. School/Employment Status of Members of the Treated and Untreated Subgroups 56

Table 5. Program Cost on a Per-Intern Basis for Three Levels of Program Size 89

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

So many people contributed to the research summarized in this report that it is difficult to know where to begin. Within RMC, major contributions were, of course, made by the authors of the individual-task, interim and final reports summarized herein. These authors include Classie M. Foat, Leonard S. Klibanoff, Nelly P. Stromquist, and Sandra D. Yuen. Other staff members to whom we are grateful are Roberto Alvarez, Nona N. Gamel, Mary Pat Gaspich, Gregory Puorro, Linda Terhune, and Christine T. Wood. The manuscripts for this and the final task reports were prepared by Terri K. Jaber whose speed, diligence, and attention to detail are very much appreciated.

Many persons at NIE made significant contribution through review of our work, their own investigations, and consultation with professional colleagues. Howard Lesnick was our NIE Project Officer for the first two years and contributed much of value to the study. Daniel P. Antonoplos served in that capacity for the remainder of the contract period and was also unusually helpful. Charles Stalford gave much of his time to the project and made many valuable contributions. Lois-Ellen Datta, although she had little time, was also most helpful--especially in the early days of the study.

We are especially grateful to our outstanding Advisory Panel composed of Paul Bennewitz (first year only), David Hampson, Addison Hobbes (last year only), Sidney Marland, William Mirengoff, Beatrice Reubens, Rodney Riffel, and Joseph Yeager. The contributions made by this group were major indeed.

We are also heavily indebted to our friends and colleagues at OIC/A and the CIP sites. Of the OIC/A staff we worked especially closely with Marie Amey-Taylor, Robert Jackson, C. Benjamin Lattimore, and Elaine Simon. At the sites, more people were helpful than can be acknowledged here. We are perhaps most indebted, however, to Audrea Blanding, Mary Le[illegible], and Edward Yarney.

We have omitted the names of many other persons whose contributions are evident throughout this and the companion reports. While we bear full responsibility for any deficiencies in the research as well as the reports, we are pleased to share with them the credit for whatever contributions may have been made.

GKT
PGT
DMF

FOREWORD

The undersigned have served as an advisory panel to the CIP project since its inception, having convened formally four times for several days each during the period, for review of progress. We endorse this evaluation report, and commend it to the serious attention of appropriate legislative and executive agencies.

We have found RMC to be competent, objective, and diligent in its pursuit of the evaluation mission, and draw attention to the following specific features of RMC's performance:

1. The staff has taken seriously and responded to the counsel of the Panel.
2. New knowledge concerning programs of this sort has been generated.
3. Useful and generalizable experience in the science and art of evaluation has been documented for the benefit of future exercises of this kind.
4. Specific recommendations and guidelines which we endorse have been offered.

Without doubt, the engagement of OIC/A leadership and staff as a component of the CIP project has been an essential ingredient in the effective conduct and evaluation of the several CIP activities noted herein. As the CIP concept evolves and expands in the future, as we truly hope it will, we urge the continuing formal engagement of OIC/A, or its equivalent, if any, as a source of conceptualization, technical assistance, and sophisticated counsel.

Replication of CIPs

We urge that the CIP concept be made available nationally as one of the respectable and promising responses to the needs of a great many young people. While not the only instrument for this serious obligation of our society, the CIP is, in our judgment, a viable and credible model of an alternative to the present educational system.

The demonstration exercise now concluding has brought together fruitfully the staff and resources of DOL and ED in a singularly compatible unity of purpose and function. As the future extension of the model is weighed, we urge a regularization and continuity of this joint responsibility between the Departments in leadership, guidance, monitoring, and funding. We note that federal funding will, for the foreseeable future, be essential to the extension of the concept.

As the federal agencies advance the concept, however, we caution against over-prescriptive criteria, and the dampening of local initiative and creativity in the formulation of new CIP programs, provided the broad goals, structure, and particularly the exceptional ethos or affect of the CIP are sustained.

Clearly the CIP concept rests heavily upon the commitment and compatibility of the LEA, including administration and faculty. In keeping with this promise, notwithstanding the CIP's necessary differences in style and structure, the procedures for professional staff selection, certification and compensation should be consistent with LEA policies. Furthermore, the extension of the CIP model should be broadly adapted to the conventional academic year. CIPs, however, should be able to conduct regular academic, non-traditional, paid and voluntary student activities during the summer weeks.

Counsel to the Sponsoring Agencies

Our experience with this project, extended deliberations with the RMC and OIC staffs, and a careful study of the final report, lead us to offer the following counsel to any agencies or institutions sponsoring programs of this kind, even if not modeled specifically on the CIP:

1. Evaluation should remain an integral part of future extensions of such programs, including CIPs.

2. In the light of this and similar projects, insistence upon the establishment of control groups for comparison of outcomes should be reconsidered. Notwithstanding diligent efforts to enroll and retain members of the control group, the difficulties of doing so produce severe skewing of measured results, indeed risking grave flaws in the quantifiable findings.

3. Accord respectful attention to the non-quantifiable, intuitive and even anecdotal findings of the investigations, acknowledging that the presumed scientific integrity of numbers, qua numbers, no matter how doubtful, is somehow perceived by some agencies and legislators as preferable to the judgments of skilled observers.

4. The start-up of non-traditional programs of this type, relying heavily upon deliberate and detailed planning and staffing, should not be hastened or pressured into premature installation in order to accommodate to funding cycles or inappropriate contract conditions.

5. The construction of specifications concerning evaluation contracts should, at the start, be very general, allowing programs to be initiated. Following a period of stable activity, final and detailed evaluation specifications can be drawn in keeping with the reality of the program's character, and their inescapable and desirable idiosyncracies.

6. Finally, in the likelihood that some form of youth education/work legislation will evolve over the years ahead, federal agencies should keep the CIP model clearly in mind as an elegant instrument for the realization of the education/work concept for some young people.

David H. Hampson, Director, Center for Studies in Social Policy,

Addison Hobbs, Director of Vocational Education, State Department of Education, Maryland

Sidney P. Marland, Former U.S. Commissioner of Education

William Mirengoff, Member of the Committee on Evaluation of Employment and Training Programs, National Academy of Sciences

Beatrice Reubens, Senior Research Associate, Columbia University

Joseph Yaeger, Corporate Staff, Pfizer Corporation

I. INTRODUCTION

Background

Unemployment, particularly among economically disadvantaged and minority youth who have not completed high school, is a major social problem in the United States. In recent years many programs have been developed in an attempt to combat this problem. Until recently, however, such attempts have been small and fragmentary, and usually undertaken at the local level rather than the state or federal levels.

One development of great significance grew out of the creation of a community-based organization called the Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America (OIC/A). Founded in 1964 by the Reverend Dr. Leon H. Sullivan, pastor of the Zion Baptist Church in Philadelphia, OIC/A was dedicated to providing education and training to Blacks and other minorities so that they might enjoy some of the social benefits not available to uneducated and unskilled laborers. By 1974, Dr. Sullivan had seen his organization expand to some 100 job-training sites across the nation that had served more than 150,000 men and women of all ages.

It was in 1970 that OIC/A began to consider working with youth who, with a better education, would have the potential of attaining more productive and fulfilling roles in society. It seemed to Dr. Sullivan that OIC/A could serve such youth by adding a general education component to its career training programs. Two years later, the Career Intern Program (CIP) was launched with a grant from the U.S. Office of Education.

A Brief Program Description

The Career Intern Program (CIP) is an alternative high school designed to serve disadvantaged and alienated students (called "interns") who either dropped out of regular high schools or who were considered potential dropouts. The objectives of the program are to enable interns to earn regular high school diplomas (as opposed to GEDs), to prepare them for meaningful employment or post-secondary education, and to facilitate their transition from school to work. The program offers extensive counseling and attempts to make academic subjects palatable and relevant to the lives of the interns through the infusion of career-oriented content.

The CIP "treatment" comprises five components: instruction, counseling, "Hands-On" (career exposure), diagnosis/assessment, and climate. Class sizes are kept small (15 interns) as are counselor case loads (35 interns). Instruction is individualized, and counseling encompasses personal and family problems as well as academic progress. All aspects of the program attempt to deal with "the whole person."

Immediately following their enrollment, interns work out a career development plan with their counselors. During their first semester, they attend a daily Career Counseling Seminar that is taught by instructor/counselor teams, and conduct in-depth studies of two career fields. In addition, they attend academic classes and meet regularly with their counselors. During the next phase of the program, counseling is continued and interns progress through the academic courses they need to graduate. In addition, they participate in two, one-or-two-week Hands-On experiences where they actually work or "job shadow" in career fields matched to their interests.

As interns approach graduation, CIP assists in placing them in jobs, college, or post-secondary training programs. Counseling and follow-up continue for six months to a year after graduation.

Central to the success of the program is its climate. The CIP strives to project a positive and caring attitude toward participating interns. At the same time it is firm. Interns are held responsible for their actions and their progress through the program. They must attend regularly, conform to dress and behavior codes, and generally learn to accept the norms of the world of work.

Interns are recognized as individuals by all members of the staff who, not incidentally, are selected to serve as role models. Staff members tend to be young, dedicated, and of the same ethnic origin as the students. Since most of them come from similar backgrounds and have faced similar problems, they are able to understand and sympathize with the interns while still maintaining high expectations for them. These characteristics distinguish them from many of their counterparts in the public schools who must bear a large portion of the blame for alienating the youths from school and from "the system."

After several years of development and operation, the CIP was evaluated by Richard A. Gibboney Associates (Gibboney Associates, 1977) and found to be successful. The evidence of success was judged to be sound by the Joint (U.S. Office of Education and National Institute of Education) Dissemination Review Panel, and the program was approved by that group as eligible for federally funded dissemination.

The Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act

In 1977, a major, consolidated effort to deal with the youth unemployment problem was launched via Public Law 95-93, the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act (YEDPA). This legislation created four major youth programs and provided significant discretionary authority for new approaches to helping young men and women who were "at risk" of dropping out--not only from school, but from mainstream America. It was under the discretionary authority of the YEDPA legislation that the Department of Labor (DOL) decided to test the replicability of the CIP and to determine whether the same beneficial outcomes could be obtained in the replication sites that were observed in Philadelphia.

DOL entered into an Interagency Agreement with the National Institute of Education (NIE) to manage both the replication effort and the independent evaluation which is summarized in this report.

NIE contracted with OIC/A for the replication effort. That organization, in turn, through a competitive bidding process, selected four local OIC chapters to establish the new CIPs. Three of the selected sites were urban and one was located in a small (pop. 32,000) city.

Overview of the Evaluation

The work statement for the evaluation was prepared jointly by NIE and DOL. Four separate tasks were called for:

- Task A. Conduct studies and analyses as required to answer the questions, "What happens to the Career Intern Program in the process of implementation in additional sites? What factors account for the changes or adaptations, if any? For the fidelity, if any, to the original program goals and practices?" (RFP NIE-R-78-0004, p. 9).
- Task B. Conduct studies and analyses as required to answer the question, "Does the Career Intern Program continue to be effective in helping youth when it is implemented in sites other than the Philadelphia prototype?" (ibid, p. 13).
- Task C. Conduct studies and analyses as required to answer the question, "What happens to young people in the CIP program that could account for its effectiveness?" (ibid, p. 16).
- Task D. Conduct studies and analyses as required to answer the fourth question, "How does the CIP approach compare in effectiveness, feasibility, impact, and factors important for policy with other approaches undergoing comparable evaluations, to helping the population to be served through the Youth Employment Act?" (ibid, p. 20).

Each of these tasks has now been completed. The methodology employed, the findings, and the implications are described in detail in final reports for each task (Treadway, Stromquist, Fetterman, Foat, & Tallmadge, 1981, for Task A; Tallmadge & Yuen, 1981, for Task B; Fetterman, 1981, for Task C; and Stromquist, 1981, Foat, 1981, and Kilbanoff, 1981, for Task D). The present report attempts to synthesize across tasks and to give an overarching perspective on the three-year evaluation effort. As a summary report, however, it necessarily lacks the detail contained in the individual task reports. For that reason, an attempt has been made to include in this document references to the others wherever we felt that readers with particular interests might want more detailed information.

Throughout the evaluation effort, RMC was assisted by an Advisory Panel comprising some of the nation's most competent authorities on youth programs. That group provided valuable suggestions not only to the evaluation but to all actors in the CIP replication effort. A statement made by the Advisory Panel after their last meeting is included as the Foreword to this report.

Organization of this Report

The next chapter of this report presents a detailed description of the CIP "model"--an idealized conception of what the program should look like and how it should operate under the best of all possible conditions. In Chapter III, we present narrative description of implementation events at each site. These case histories derive from both the Task A and Task C analyses.

Chapter IV summarizes the Task B outcome analyses while Chapter V discusses features of the program that appear critical to its success. Chapter VI draws upon the information in Chapters III through V and attempts to provide simple and straightforward answers to the specific research questions posed in the original Request for Proposal. Chapter VII is the final chapter. It provides an overall assessment of the CIP, presents a few recommendations for changes in the program design, discusses ways in which the implementation of future replications could be improved, and incorporates several policy recommendations regarding the federal role in demonstrations of this nature.

II. CIP DESCRIPTION

The CIP is an alternative educational program with a focus on career development. The program is designed for high school dropouts and students considered to be at high risk of dropping out. Any actual or potential dropout who can meet the minimum criterion of reading at the fifth-grade level is eligible for the CIP. The key characteristics of the CIP are that it is an "alternative" program and that it has a "career orientation."

The CIP is "alternative" in a number of respects. First, it is small. The original design called for about 150-200 interns to be participating at any given time. In the demonstration sites, active enrollment ranged from 50 to 183 young people after the sites had completed their start-up periods. Second, there is a larger staff-to-intern ratio in the CIP than in regular high schools. The four replication CIPs each had about 17 professional staff members comprising administrators (4), instructors (7-8), counselors (3-4), and career developers (2). There were also four to five support personnel at each site. The combination of small program size and high staff-to-intern ratio is intended to allow staff members and interns to develop close, supportive relationships, leading to the growth of a strong group identity and a familial and caring, though not permissive, climate.

The CIP is designed to motivate young people who are "turned off" about learning to care about succeeding in education and in life generally. Therefore, the CIP's environment is literally supposed to be therapeutic. Consequently the personal qualities of the staff members are extremely important. The CIP's small size and high staff-to-intern ratios can have the desired effect only if the staff members truly care about the interns and explicitly reinforce the kinds of behavior and attitudes to which the interns should aspire. The attitudes and interpersonal skills of applicants for CIP staff positions are thus considered as carefully as their professional and experiential qualifications. CIP staff members must be committed both to working with the "difficult" young people at whom the program is aimed and to working as team members in close coordination with their colleagues.

Only with a team effort can the CIP realistically hope to "deal with the whole person," a central philosophical tenet of all OIC programs. This orientation is based on the belief that segregating a person's different roles--family member, student, worker, socializer, etc.--and interacting with only one of them will fail to effect the kind of total life change disadvantaged and unmotivated youths need to become successful. Moreover, staff members are expected to be role models, demonstrating the kind of behaviors that interns are expected to acquire in order to achieve success in their future careers. This modeling includes dress and personal grooming as well as being on time for appointments, completing assignments, and working cooperatively, for instance.

There are codes of conduct and dress for both interns and staff members. Comparable sanctions are applied to violations--such as unexcused absences and smoking in unauthorized places--by interns and staff members alike. Interns are expected to learn these work-a-day norms both through the formal rules of the CIP's codes of dress and conduct and from the examples of the staff members. One CIP instructor explained the rationale for behavior and dress codes very simply: "There is an appropriate way to dress and behave at work; it's like wearing two suits, one at home and one at work."

The CIP is also alternative in the kinds of instruction and counseling it offers. Classes are small, with no more than 15 interns. But instructional methods are also varied and non-traditional. Although instructors do lecture and will call the entire class's attention to a single topic that is relevant to everyone, most academic work is done individually or in groups of two or three. Instructional materials are frequently "learning packets" developed to teach a single unit. Interns follow directions contained in the packets to use specific materials and engage in specific activities intended to lead them to mastery of the unit's objectives. Completion of one packet leads to the next in the curriculum sequence. In the replication sites, interns used both packets that had been developed in the CIP prototype and locally developed packets.

The instructor's role in a CIP classroom is chiefly that of consultant/facilitator. Except for the usually brief and infrequent times he/she gives a lecture or leads a whole-class discussion, the instructor most often circulates about the room giving encouragement, asking questions, and discussing points in the material with individual interns and small groups. At times, the instructor meets with interns at his/her desk. Thus, CIP instruction is largely individualized in both pace and content, ensuring that interns work at rates appropriate to their abilities and at levels consistent with their achievement.

Interns generally responded very positively to this approach to instruction. One intern's comments suggest the value of the learning packets:

> It's a lot easier, it's a whole lot easier.... You can carry them around like a whole lot of notes in your notebook plus the fact you already have the answers on it. After you read your packet you do the answers on them; if you have to inspect your notes again you just take the same packet as in the class, instead of openin' up the book, finding a section and rippin' the pages out and puttin' the pages back in. That's the situation around here and it gives us a chance to go over ourselves to see what we're doing; if we don't like it we can find a little research on it. It gives us a chance to have better understanding of our homework.

Counseling in the CIP is also very different from that found in most public schools. The counselors' small case loads are very important in this regard, because they enable them to get to know the interns and work with them on more than just scheduling and disciplinary issues. The advantage of small case loads is augmented by the CIP's conscious approach of dealing with more than just academic and other school-related areas. CIP counselors get involved with interns in all aspects of their lives, from their career aspirations and academic needs, to family relationships, to intimate personal matters. Counselors also help interns find the resources, such as child care or part-time jobs, that they need in order to attend school. As appropriate, under certain circumstances, they refer interns to other social service agencies.

Interns meet with counselors on a regularly scheduled basis at least every two weeks. Additional counseling sessions can be arranged as needed. There are also formal assessment sessions at the end of each CIP term. In these "Intern Formalized Assessments," counselors systematically review plans, progress, and unmet academic requirements with each intern and, if possible, with his/her parents. Counselors also go to each intern's home to get to know the family and the home environment. Home visits serve the dual purpose of involving interns' parents in the CIP process and providing diagnostic insights for the CIP staff.

The career focus of the CIP is maintained both explicitly and implicitly. As mentioned earlier, CIP rules include dress and behavior codes intended to teach interns the norms of the world of work. Emphasis is placed on attending classes regularly, completing assignments, and arriving on time for appointments. The CIP is very explicit in pointing out the extent of each intern's responsibility for meeting program expectations. Making interns responsible for their own success is intended to prepare them for the real-world expectations they will encounter after graduation. Imparting this sense of responsibility begins with a "contract" they sign upon enrollment in the CIP. In this document, each intern explicitly agrees to abide by CIP rules and policies. The other side of the coin, of course, is that the CIP's supportive climate, constant encouragement, and "can-do" philosophy are intended to motivate interns to live up to program expectations.

Interns generate a Career Development Plan (CDP) immediately following their enrollment. These documents become the basis for planning their programs in the CIP--the courses they will take, the career fields they will study and observe, the post-CIP plans they will make. The CDPs are used by the counselors as a way to keep the interns' goals in view as progress is reviewed and decisions are made.

During the first semester of participation, interns attend a Career Counseling Seminar (CCS). The CCS is taught by teams of counselors and instructors. It combines instruction about career fields and career planning--such as how to use an employment service--with group counseling and role playing (such as simulated employment interviews) relevant to selecting and entering career fields. Guest speakers are brought into the CCS to talk about different careers and to answer questions. The culmination of the CCS is independent research into two career fields. Interns are expected to prepare reports about the two fields as a final exercise for the CCS.

Upon satisfactory completion of the CCS course, interns become eligible to participate in "Hands-On" career exploration experiences. A Hands-On is a one- or two-week placement in a work environment. The specific activities that occur during the placement are up to the employer who has volunteered to allow the intern into the work place. During the CIP replication project these activities ranged from passive observation to full participation in job duties. Interns choose their two Hands-On placements according to their career preferences. Ideally the placements correspond to the two career fields they researched for the CCS. Following their Hands-On experiences, interns prepare short reports describing what they did and what they learned.

Another mechanism for focusing the CIP on careers is infusion of career-related content into the academic curriculum. Instructors attempt to point out the relevance of academic subjects to work situations and to use examples and illustrations that exemplify how academic skills apply to jobs. The intent of such infusion is, of course, to motivate interns to learn academic skills because of their demonstrated importance for career success.

Finally, the career aspect of the CIP is reinforced by field trips to observe work settings. Through contacts established by the career developers, arrangements are made for groups of interns to visit businesses, factories, social service agencies, hospitals, and so on. The visits then become topics for class discussions, research, and other instructional activities. They are also intended to motivate the interns.

The daily life of the CIP is marked by the following distinguishing characteristics. The first class of the day is the CCS, which is required of all interns during their first semester. The CCS is scheduled in the first period of the day both to motivate attendance and to prevent late arrivals from missing LEA-required academic courses. In the second and subsequent semesters, interns attend academic classes during this period or do not begin classes until the second period. CCS sessions are lively, with animated discussions, role playing, and a good bit of fun. The teaming of instructors and counselors to teach CCS provides a variety of simultaneous activities and creative, resourceful planning. Occasional guest speakers also enliven the CCS.

Class periods in the CIP are just under an hour long, so the morning has four classes. After CCS, interns go to academic classes. Hands-On participants usually report directly to their placement sites. They may return to the CIP in the afternoon, depending on how long they stay at the placement each day.

As interns pass between classes, there is a good deal of socializing and horseplay, as at any high school. However, a difference from regular high schools is noted in the more relaxed atmosphere. The interns' interaction seems less frenetic and sarcastic than that observed in the feeder schools. The interaction also involves CIP staff members who might happen to be in the halls, and there is acceptance and fondness evident in staff-intern relationships. No doubt some of the relaxed nature of these times is due to the overall size of the CIP. Passages are not crowded and people do not have to go long distances in short times between classes. However, it is also abundantly clear that goodwill and mutual acceptance among interns and between interns and staff members truly exist in the CIPs. A particularly concrete indication of this positive climate in the four replication CIPs was the general absence of derogatory graffiti in the sites.

The same positive affect is also evident in CIP classes and counseling sessions. While the CIP design allows a maximum of 15 interns in class at one time, class size averaged about 10 in the replication sites. Most of the classroom activities involve individual interns or small groups working on learning packets. The instructor moves about the room helping the interns with tasks, suggesting resources, and giving encouragement. Occasionally the instructor will lead the whole class in a discussion or give a short talk about a particular subject. The relationships evidenced between instructors and interns are different from those seen in regular schools in three ways. First, instructors are able to devote significant amounts of time to individual interns. Second, instructors show that they know quite a bit about the interns as individuals. Personal as well as academic subjects are discussed by instructors and interns. Finally, positive feelings between instructors and interns are demonstrated by the way they interact.

In counseling sessions, further confirmation of the special nature of staff-intern relations is demonstrated. Counselors and interns discuss all aspects of interns' lives, not just scheduling and discipline, as is customary at regular schools. The affect between counselors and interns is noticeably positive, and interns frequently refer to their counselors fondly and point out the major role counselors play in their lives. These manifestations of goodwill reflect both the small case loads and the personal attributes of the counselors.

During the lunch period, there is again much socializing. Staff members frequently eat with interns, and lively conversations are apparent.

After lunch, classes and counseling appointments resume for another two or three periods. Physical education classes are most often held in the afternoon. In the CIP sites, PE was held in different locations because the CIPs did not have gyms. Attendance was also lower in the afternoon as interns with part-time jobs left to go to work. These interns arranged to have all of their classes in the morning so that they could both work and attend the CIP. Because of the PE classes and part-time jobs, the CIPs were less populated during the afternoons.

Classes in the replication CIPs usually ended about three o'clock. Staff meetings were held after that time. The CIPs held staff meetings for a variety of reasons--planning, coordination, and intern evaluation. Extensive joint planning and coordination are necessary for the CIP to have its intended impact on "the whole person." Instructors reinforce one another's lessons by using similar illustrations; counselors keep instructors abreast of events in interns' lives that may affect their academic work, and instructors keep counselors up to date on interns' academic progress.

A regular staff meeting in the CIP is called the "disposition conference" (or "dispo"). These meetings are held often enough so that the entire intern population is reviewed every two weeks. The general purpose of the dispos and the other staff meetings is to ensure that each intern is treated in a systematic, coordinated fashion by the entire program. Without this coordination, the CIP would resemble typical high school programs--which turned the interns off to begin with.

In the dispo each intern is brought up for discussion. Those instructors who have the intern in a class and the intern's counselor comment on his/her progress. If there are problems, the group formulates a plan for addressing them, and someone takes responsibility for putting the plan into effect. Progress of the plan and its outcomes are reported in subsequent dispos, until the problems are resolved. Thus, the CIP places a high premium on providing each intern with an integrated, comprehensive experience. Frequent, systematic staff planning, coordination, and evaluation meetings are intended to ensure the quality of the interns' experience in the CIP.

During RMC's study of the CIP replications, a great deal of effort was put into analyzing how and why the CIP is successful. The major elements responsible for success have been mentioned throughout this description: small program size, supportive program climate, high expectations and intern responsibility, individual attention, highly motivated staff members, and commitment to coordination. The most important factor in successfully initiating and operating the CIP appears to be the skillful leadership needed to orchestrate its separate elements into a coherent, purposive whole. When the CIPs had good directors, they operated very effectively; when they did not, operations deteriorated. To conclude this description, therefore, we present comments about CIP management drawn from an extensive interview with one of the most successful CIP directors.

The formal technique that I have used specifically has been management by objectives. It is management by objectives in the sense that everybody here, the entire staff, knows about the objectives of the program. Number two, that they know specifically the goals that are expected of them to accomplish and when. Number three has been the liberty to increase innovation. The teachers have all kinds of liberties to experiment in anything whatsoever in the classroom.

The important aspect here, in setting up your objectives and the rest of it, has been the action process. And the action process is trying to constantly review what is going on in the classroom, checking if this is going on in the classroom. And it has been the area where I am definitely interested in seeing lesson plans. Copies of lesson plans provide me with the knowledge of what is going to go on in the classroom this week. What will go on on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, whatever it is. So when I go to the classroom (I observe the classes constantly), I like to hear something about what you said you would do according to your plan. With that kind of result, I have been able to consistently monitor the instructional process which is actually going on in the classroom situation.

Another part of it has been discipline which is realistic. There are certain kinds of policies which have not been effective because they are not enforceable, and we don't do those things just for the sake of doing them. If the policy is not working, and after we review it and we find out that there are really definite operational difficulties in them, we change those policies.

The other part of it has been no-nonsense management and the no-nonsense management system, based on my concern about how effective our program is becoming. The way I did it is to concentrate on the programmatic objectives. I have myself some sort of ratio which I operated by, 85 percent of every staff's concern should be focused on the program. Ten percent, I agree goes into staff problems. The five percent, jiving around if you want to, 'cause people are going to jive around. The result has been that, when we meet, our major concerns have

> been what, how, and in what respects are we going to collectively provide input for the program's success.
>
> The second aspect has been that, in the past, because of probably not developing a process-action to program-operation sequence, some people have just been complacent. I have not allowed complacency in the program because I believe in my heart that as soon as you allow complacency to breed into your program, the program starts atrophying. The way we did it was to take a functional inventory about the expertise of individuals here and expand it to program provisions. Somebody who walked in here as a counselor, I found out that person has expertise in economics.
>
> I don't think we could have supplied this program optimum service or time if we had just confined ourselves to the task which we were supposed to do by title--counselor. In order for us to reduce boredom and increase our functional ability, what we did was, 'Oh, you are here as a counselor but in your educational area, what other areas do you have strengths?' 'Well, my strengths are in math.' Fine. Then what you do is give us help in math. So we have somebody who is a counselor teaching physical education, doing math, and still counseling. You are not going to have any time for yourself during the day to go through boredom where you move from one cubicle to another cubicle just conversing because you have too much time on your hands. It's done in a very subtle way.

This CIP director's management philosophy clearly demonstrates the kind of staff commitment and the integrated, comprehensive approach needed to make the program function.

III. SITE CASE HISTORIES

Site A

The city where Site A is located has approximately 500,000 residents and is ethnically diverse. Its minority population (17%) includes balanced proportions of Blacks, Asians, Spanish Americans, and native Americans. The city has a diversified economy and, as one instructor commented, "The economy is now in an upswing. There are lots of jobs with _____ now. There is unemployment, but [it] is very low." (The unemployment rate among 16-to-21-year-olds was approximately 16%.)

Urban decay is not as prevalent as in some major cities, though there are areas of poverty and substandard housing. The city is also characterized by a "complacency"--the result of a deceptively subtle form of poverty where "there is just enough to get by," according to a former staff member. As one instructor commented:

> There are jobs out there, short term and the like, but they don't go anywhere. They [interns] don't realize that.... Poverty in this city is deceptively subtle, don't let it fool you. You won't see the torn down crumbling buildings like _____ [another major city] but you go on _____ and _____ [streets] the houses don't look too bad but it's worse in a way. They [interns] are satisfied with their position in life. Their part-time jobs. A dollar's worth of gas is enough for most of them that have cars. They'll just cruise on it until they're empty. Then they'll just wait until they earn another couple of dollars.... It's not like poverty like you see in other cities; its deceiving.

The city has traditionally supported alternative education. When the CIP was introduced, there were about a dozen other alternative high schools attended by some 1,250 students. City-wide the dropout rate was approximately 6%. At the alternative high schools it was just over 40%.

The site itself is housed in half of a former religious school. A low-income apartment complex faces the CIP directly across the street. A few deteriorated houses can be found down the block. The site is located near a local "main drag," and is only a mile from one of its feeder high schools.

Site A, along with the other sites, received a contract from OIC/A on 15 December, 1977. The director of the program was selected from the local OIC. A "program manager" was hired to serve in the dual role of instructional supervisor and general program manager (in contrast to the other programs where the instructional supervisors did not have general management responsibilities).

An LEA school-liaison person was assigned to the CIP in January, 1978, and an LEA curriculum consultant was assigned in February. During this time period, the program was incorporated into the LEA as an alternative school. Site A was unique in this respect (the other sites remained independent of the LEAs), and the arrangement proved to be a disincentive for feeder school cooperation early in the demonstration. In the other sites, students served by the CIP remained on the feeder school's rolls. Thus, monies distributed on the basis of average daily attendance continued to flow to the feeder school. At Site A, when students enrolled in the CIP, they had to be removed from the feeder school's roll and there was a consequent loss of funds. As a result, the schools were inclined to discourage recruitment activities.

The school district did provide the CIP with a list of 3,200 dropouts as a base from which to recruit. Unfortunately, only 14 interns were successfully recruited from that list. Others were recruited by members of the CIP staff through churches, community agencies, the local OIC, and by door-to-door canvassing.

Because Site A was incorporated into the LEA, it was the only CIP to award its own diploma. In the other sites, graduates received their diplomas from the feeder schools. Students appeared to prefer receiving their diplomas from well-known institutions. Thus, at Site A, they often returned to the feeder school just before completing their requirements for graduation.

The union and the school board approved the program on 27 February and, on 20 March, Site A opened its doors to 73 first-cohort interns (the second site to begin operations). LEA support was provided in various forms at this time, e.g., arranging free bus transportation and free school lunches for interns.

RMC's evaluation contract began 1 April, 1978. Two weeks later, NIE, DOL, and OIC/A visited Site A. The NIE site-visit report noted that, in general, the CIP was progressing well. Much the same impression was obtained by RMC staff members during the course of a get-acquainted visit in mid-June, although attendance was observed to be low. Recruiting for the second cohort was well underway but summer, competition from other DOL-funded youth programs, and the less-than-enthusiastic support offered by the feeder schools made the task quite difficult.

Site A, like the other sites, was receiving considerable pressure from NIE to recruit enough youths to form a control group as well as to fill available openings in the program. After much effort, it became clear that these goals could not be met and the site was given the go-ahead to enroll the 68 applicants it had awaiting admission. On July 24th, 54 accepted the invitation and entered the program.

RMC's first data collection visit occurred in the second week of August, 1978. OIC/A was also on site, providing technical assistance to the program. Instruction was individualized and team teaching approaches were observed. Intern and staff interviews indicated high morale and dedication to the program. The only problem observed was the high turnover of managers and professional staff members (50%) during the initial eight months of operation. The NIE August, 1978, site report also indicated that there were problems with attendance, the absence of a resource center, recruitment (compounded by high attrition between testing and entry), and staff training.

Enrollments at all sites were substantially below expectations and pressures to "get more kids" continued to be applied by NIE. Most of the counseling staffs at all sites spent the majority of their time in recruiting activities--much to the detriment of their other functions. Finally, NIE and DOL agreed to collapse the planned-for third and fourth cohorts into one and to require each site to enroll 90 youths in the program and provide an additional 55 control students.

In December, NIE advised OIC/A and the sites of this decision. They were also told that failure to meet these quotas would result in termination. After an exhausting effort, Site A managed to meet its enrollment objectives and the program began serving third-cohort interns on 5 February, 1979. The threats of termination, however, had negatively affected staff morale and turnover.

RMC's second data-collection visit to Site A, in late February 1979, revealed that, while the program's components were mechanically in place and interns perceived the CIP as a good place to be, intern attendance was low and staff morale problems were surfacing. A major problem detracting from the program climate and directly contributing to intern absenteeism resulted from the absences and repeated late arrivals of several instructors and counselors. This situation affected staff morale because many individuals appeared "to get away with it" without being penalized. Staff members complained of "inconsistent messages" and blamed the problem on "weak management" and poor communications from administration to staff. Many staff members felt frustrated in their attempts to do their jobs when requests were bottlenecked at administrative levels of both the CIP and the OIC.

While a supportive climate pervaded the CIP, rules governing attendance and dress did not appear to be vigorously enforced. Tardiness during the first period (when the CCS is offered) was severe. It was also quite noticeable in other classes. Attendance was also a problem, averaging around 60% but lower on Fridays. Regarding discipline, the attitudes of teachers and counselors did not appear consensual. Some were annoyed at the interns' behavior and enforced conduct and dress rules on their own. Others took a laissez-faire approach. Expressing dissatisfaction in this regard, one counselor said, "Our problem is that we haven't been too effective in discipline. The inability to implement the intern's code of conduct, for instance. You have to get support all the way down the line. It's important to be consistent with our policy."

Since RMC's earlier visit, there had been five additional resignations, including that of the second program manager. While he had not been highly regarded professionally by instructors because of a lack of educational experience, his departure was symptomatic of the general malaise that existed. Furthermore, the LEA curriculum consultants had been explicitly isolated at the director's order, and they were unhappy and frustrated.

A staff committee to establish policies and procedures was instituted in March, 1979. It recommended an Intern Code of Conduct and a Dress Code in April which led to strong intern feelings against the program and to a brief and generally ineffective boycott by interns.

RMC issued an interim report on CIP implementation in March. The report described both the successes and the problems each site had encountered to that date. Unfortunately, the Site A OIC chose to communicate only the negative information to the site staff in an attempt to "whip them into shape." Instead of producing the desired effect, the action served instead to demoralize the staff.

> We sat there and listened to it [the report] and it got worse and worse and worse. After a while I got up and asked him, "Did they say anything good?" and the reply was: "It wasn't conveyed to me."

It was not long after this event that the director resigned--not only from the CIP but from the OIC as well. There was much concern about the future, and implementation was at a standstill. Enrollment had dropped from 148 at the end of January to 80 interns at the end of April.

When RMC next visited at the end of April, 1979, there was, understandably, fierce resentment expressed by the CIP staff. An afternoon-long meeting between the staff and the site visitors helped to confront the issue, but confidence was restored only gradually. Operation was perfunctory in regard to program mechanics, and the CIP's climate was very negative.

A new director was appointed late in May, 1979, and he began major efforts to recoup interns who had dropped out and to develop a strong summer program. A new counseling supervisor was brought in from the OIC in June to complete the management team, which then consisted of a second director, the third program manager, and the third counseling supervisor. However, in August the program manager resigned, and, in September, was followed by the director. The counseling supervisor was then named director, and he filled the position of program manager and counseling supervisor from within the CIP staff.

During the summer of 1979, discussions about extending the demonstration were underway at the national level, so Site A began once again to recruit, though on an informal basis. At the end of September there were 91 potential interns awaiting intake testing.

In December, 1979, RMC visited Site A for the fourth official data-collection period. Despite the earnest efforts of the director and program manager, staff and intern morale were very low. The staff seemed barely interested in their work; most confided they were looking for jobs. There was hope, though, that the large number of interns who were expected to enroll for the extension period would give new life to the program. However, staff members reported major communications problems with the director, who was felt to be autocratic and insufficiently experienced in alternative education.

Intern attendance was very low, reflecting the negativism that seemed to pervade the entire site. RMC site visitors counted only 23 interns in attendance on one day. They also observed six intern fights during the first week of the visit. In one class, two female interns were observed literally tearing each other's hair out. LEA officials were aware of most of these difficulties. They chose, however, to give the new administration the opportunity to respond to these problems before attempting to intervene.

DOL and NIE finally authorized a nine-month extension of the CIP demonstration. The fact that the extension was for 9 instead of the expected 18 months came as an unpleasant surprise to staff at all of the sites. The authorization, furthermore, was not announced until two weeks before the original demonstration was scheduled to end, a delay that caused substantial unrest among staff members at all levels.

When the site was given authorization to enroll a new cohort, testing began immediately. By 27 February, 1980, 102 applicants had been assigned to the CIP, but only 78 actually enrolled. More interns were subsequestly taken in, but they were not counted as part of the official treatment group. These "administrative admits" brought enrollment to 99 in April. In March, the fourth program manager resigned, and was replaced by an outside person.

When RMC visited again at the end of April, the increased size of the student body had improved the climate somewhat. However, staff morale was as low as before and there were many complaints about the director's leadership. The counseling supervisor and the director could barely disguise their disagreements. Ultimately, the counseling supervisor was fired. She, along with a few of her colleagues, believed that she was fired as a result of openly voicing her concerns about management. She was at odds with the director, as were many others; however, she tried to "reconcile our differences since we have to work together." She elaborated:

> I was trying to be real. I told him it was the way he communicated, not what he had to say. I told him that...he had to be sensitive to that fact as long as he's workin' with Blacks....You just can't be dealin' with Black folk that way, talkin' down to them, tellin' what to do all the time.... Tellin' 'em do it or you're fired.... You must try a little give and take, and things might go smoother, you know.

In a number of the cases, the director's actions were perceived by staff as the "measures of an insecure, threatened administrator." Half of the staff complained that "the program was being run by intimidation." One counselor said, "I fear to say anything, without fear of losing my job." Another staff member explained part of the problem (as he perceived it) to the RMC site visitor:

> You know, we were told not to talk to you about the problems, but it's getting desperate, we've got to tell somebody.... We're told to respect the chain of command but he doesn't. He fired a new counselor without even askin' _____ (the counseling supervisor). He reprimanded _____ (career developer) for speaking her mind at a staff meeting.... He's clearing out the old staff, you can see it. Weren't you surprised, you come here and there's only a few of us left?

A clear indication of low staff morale was the local newspaper's appearance on staff members' desks each morning--opened to the classified section, with professional job openings circled in ink.

An analysis of the physical setting provides further insight into the underlying administrative isolation and lack of trust. The director's office is located in the far end of the building. It is routinely locked during the day. Inside the office the desks of the two top administrators are blocked from sight by large partitions that had been installed since the previous site visit. Similarly, the secretary's desk had been moved from its original position in the center of the room, first to the door and finally to a separate room--another physical manifestation of the lack of trust in the office. The significance of these physical manifestations was confirmed by a series of informal interviews with the individuals involved.

Despite the negative climate that prevailed, the program continued to function. In May, 1980, plans were made for a summer program that would take maximum advantage of good weather. During a break between the end of the school year and the beginning of the summer program, the staff held a number of training workshops. On 21 July, the first summer session opened with 61 interns, 25 of whom had enrolled just for the summer to get high school credits not available in the public schools. Two interns graduated on 25 July in OIC ceremonies. The second summer session began on 11 August.

RMC's sixth visit occurred the last week of the second summer session, 25-29 August. By actual count, attendance ranged from 21 to 31 interns, of 67 enrolled. There was little coordination observed between instructors and counselors, and open arguments erupted between staff members. The CIP leadership was criticized by staff members in both departments. The counseling supervisor had recently resigned and the announced resignations of the director and program manager were to take effect at the end of August. The extensive turnover had left very few staff members who had ever been trained or even formally oriented about the CIP design. Disposition conferences and the Career Counseling Seminar had been cancelled for the summer, and there was discussion of not reinstating the CCS in the fall. Hands-Ons had been reduced from two, one-week job exposures to informal discussions between interns and job incumbents that seldom consumed more than a few hours. Most interns did not even recognize the term when asked about their Hands-On experiences. The program was in disarray.

Summary

Site A began operating the CIP under relatively auspicious conditions. The LEA was eager to cooperate and was quick to give approval and logistical help. The program achieved a fairly full implementation status in just a few months. However, it maintained this status rather briefly. Extensive staff turnover (56 resignations, terminations, or transfers from the 22 staff positions) made program continuity most difficult to maintain. The appointed leaders of the CIP and the professional staff members, especially the instructors, never jelled into an effective team, and their differences became progresssively more salient leading to an eventual deterioration of the program. By the end of the demonstration period, 293 interns had been enrolled, 58 had graduated, and 40 remained in the CIP.

Site B

The Site B CIP is located in an inner-city area of a major metropolitan center. The local population is ethnically mixed: Black, Puerto Rican, Castillian Spanish, Italian, and Jewish. The youth unemployment rate is 57%. The immediate neighborhood of the CIP facility is moderately deteriorated. While there are burned-out buildings and litter strewn about the streets in the neighborhood, there are also many well maintained homes with neat stoops and yards. The area from which interns are drawn includes large tracts of severely depressed neighborhoods.

The area is plagued with the social ills characteristic of many inner cities throughout the United States--drugs, prostitution, arson, property decay, and so on. Especially noticeable in the surrounding blocks are many boarded-up or burned-out buildings left partially standing. The shopkeepers, parents, CIP staff, and interns all give the same explanation: arson. A local minister commented:

> They sold us out, the city fathers. They don't give a damn. The shopkeepers around here, I've known them all for years. They're running scared. They hire out to burn down their buildings. It's for the insurance. And the crime of it is HUD won't put any money into a block that has two or more houses burnt down in it. They figure it's not worth it--the rest of the block will go before long. It used to be there was a building burning down three to four a day. Now it is at a standstill; maybe it's time for a turnaround.

Interns point out the "beautiful nonsense" of the streets--old men with the DTs urinating on buildings, pimps wearing platform shoes and rabbit fur coats, open prostitution and dope transactions, gambling, "boosting," young men pitching pennies "just passing time."

Other features of the community that are noticeable are the fronts and the police. Knowing all the places in town to "cop dope" is a valuable part of street knowledge for many youths. The front is one of the more interesting places to "cop dope." A front might be, for example, a record shop or a health food store that sells legitimate products as a cover for its major business, selling narcotics. In the first front observed, two police officers clearly recognized and then calmly walked by an open drug transaction in the store. When asked why no action had been taken, the key informant replied:

> They don't need the money. They'll only bust you if they need the money you know. They get paid off regular. You take some of them, though, they'll just reach right into the register and pull the money out and leave you the nickel [bag of marijuana] that they came in to bust you for in the first place, you know what I mean, and then they let you go free, you know, as if nothin' ever happened.

This is the community atmosphere--a climate conducive to crime, dropping out, or just hanging out. The role models of "successful" adults, both male and female, are often associated with criminal activities. Though many interns come from "good homes" with responsible and respectable adult models, the street culture--a very powerful environmental force affecting interns--cannot be ignored. The program is faced with the task of altering strongly reinforced street culture behaviors and values that are antithetical to the CIP world-of-work values and rules of behavior.

The subcontract agreement between OIC/A and the Site B OIC was signed on the 15th of December, 1977. Three-fourths of the staff were recruited, oriented, and trained during that same week. The facility was modified to prepare for operations in January. By the end of January, the CIP building had been renovated--through the OIC's contribution of $120,000 not reimbursed from demonstration funds--and the LEA superintendent had endorsed the program. Some intake testing had also been conducted. However, when the CIP began making detailed logistical arrangements with the feeder school principal, the teachers' union began to object, ostensibly because of fear that the CIP would take jobs away from union teachers. (Animosity between the union and the principal of the feeder school may have been an even more important contributing factor.) The school board also delayed approval, the critical issues being CIP staff certification, awarding credit to CIP interns, and the teachers' union resistance.

The union gave its sanction to the CIP in March, 1978, under an agreement whereby the CIP would employ three union members (a condition never enforced) and recruit from a different feeder school than originally proposed. Though the school board had not yet voted its official approval, it seemed probable that it would once the certification process was completed. Working on this assumption, the CIP enrolled its first cohort of 56 interns on 17 April, 1978.

NIE set 26 April, 1978, as a deadline for Site B to obtain a school board resolution. When this deadline was not met, it was extended to 3 May, then to 25 May, next to 17 June, and eventually to 16 July, 1978. The program finally obtained the resolution that enabled it to award academic credits on 9 July, 1978. Local education agency politics and the fact that school system leadership was in the process of transition from the "lame duck" to the newly elected administration were responsible for the delay in obtaining the resolution.

The second cohort, originally scheduled for intake in September, 1978, was delayed approximately one month since major recruiting difficulties had been encountered. By mid-October, only 60 potential interns had been identified. A decision was then made to enroll all of them in the program with the provision that the remaining cohorts would have control groups.

RMC's first data-collection visit to Site B was near the end of October. The program climate at that time reflected many of the characteristics of the CIP model. Staff members were, on the whole, dedicated to the CIP approach and to helping interns. The positive attitudes of the staff were reflected in a pervasive concern for improving the program. Staff members freely expressed their enthusiasm about working in the CIP and their high hopes for its success.

Individualized pacing and personal attention were evident in each classroom. Interns were observed enthusiastically participating in role playing, brainstorming, and problem-solving activities in CCS classes. Instruction was varied in practically all reading, language arts, math, social studies, and elective classes and included the use of didactics, lecturing, small group instruction, and individual assignments. A science instructor had not yet been found. As a result, this course was taught by a group of other instructors (including the director) on a temporary basis. Science teaching, as a result, was primarily of the traditional whole-group variety.

The staff perceived the director as a leader with "strong management" skills able to make decisions on their requests regarding program operation (even though they may have disagreed with some of his decisions). They were aware of the difficulties he encountered regarding LEA politics and respected his ability to "juggle so calmly on a tightwire." Though many of the staff members considered his techniques "dictatorial," they still indicated respect for his abilities. Interns, in small groups, often joked about the director, characterizing him as a dictator, but these same interns were observed frequenting his "open door" office regularly throughout the day on their own initiative to talk or just say "hi." Interns were also seen in and out of the middle management offices--for official and unofficial personal reasons.

Staff members' interactions with interns reflected the positive climate that had been attained in Site B. They took an active role in helping the interns with serious problems in their personal lives, problems that might otherwise have interfered with their studies. One intern discussed how a counselor had helped him:

> Mr. _____ (the counselor) he's an on man. He's real little. For a little man I didn't expect so much out of him. I had certain family problems that would bother me and he told me there were ways you can get around this from a sit-down with your mother. He says, "you are 20 years old and and you still out there, you got your mind goin' in circles. You don't quite know what you want to do yet an' still you got the power within you, because we can just look at you and see the progression you makin' on your reading tests and stuff."

Interns were also held accountable for meeting behavioral norms regarding dress; for instance, interns were sent home for wearing tennis shoes or hats in school. Periodically interns would test the policy by wearing their sneakers because "they want to be told to take them off--they want the attention." Those just seeking attention--testing the policy--were recognizable because they usually had their regular shoes in their lockers. Interns were also held accountable for absences or tardiness and getting assignments in on time. The manner in which the enforcement was carried out reflected caring and concern, but also firmness. Interns' reactions to staff members' rule enforcement showed acceptance and understanding. For instance, concerning the dress code, one intern remarked:

> I think they are right you know. It's a hassle but you know somebody got to go on a job interview. They're not going to go to work and get that job wearing sneakers and no scarf on their head.

One of the strongest indications of the interns' positive feelings about the CIP in Site B was found in the manner they characterized the site.

> We are all together here as one body and all one group. We all is friends together. We're mostly like family here.... It's like our own little community here you know.

The interns also perceived the sincerity of their instructors, both as instructors and as human beings.

> Before they give us the packets they go through the course of research, researching what they're doin'...and then they hand it to us and if anything is wrong they know it's wrong. They showin' us that teachers can make mistakes. 'Cause they showin' us they're more human than just robots. That's what makes this system of this school more flexible.

Most frequently, interns spoke about the CIP in terms of its contrast to their former schools, which they described as "cesspools." Thirty to forty students in a class sitting on the desks, "cutting up" in class, mugging teachers in the classrooms and stairwells, the smell of marijuana permeating the hallways, guards in the corridors, and identification cards and passes to go into the building and from one part of the building to another were typical characteristics the interns mentioned. The major newspaper in the area reported that over a hundred unemployed teachers preferred unemployment to teaching in the schools, citing physical danger as the single greatest reason for their stance. Most students coming from these schools bitterly complained about the treatment they received in their former high schools:

> I had 21 credits but [the high school] said I only had 17, according to the computer that they had. The grades they put down. So that messed me around.

> The worst thing is your friends come up to you when you're gettin' up to go to class and says "Hey man, ya wanta get high?" What are ya gonna do? So you go with them and you start cutting the classes and the next thing I knew I wasn't in school no more. I'd come to school every morning, but I wouldn't go into the building. I'd just be out there smokin' that herb and hangin' out.

Interns were internalizing the CIP's world-of-work norms about attendance, dress, and other issues, and demonstrated it in various ways. A poignant illustration of this occurred during the site visit. A group of interns were in an uproar, protesting vehemently about a counselor who came to work wearing a scarf on her head. The interns had already internalized the negative value associated with this "taboo" behavior and "came down" on her for breaking the rules. Additional manifestations of interns' positive feelings about the CIP included: a high rate of attendance in school and at school functions such as dances; existence of a functioning student council; the ease interns displayed in talking and joking with the staff; the absence of graffiti on the walls; the absence of profanity in the building; the absence of smoking or loitering in the halls; and the courtesy and politeness demonstrated by interns with staff members and other interns alike.

During the three months between RMC's first and second site visits, two math teachers and an aide left the CIP for higher paying jobs. Two other professionals had left earlier for the same reason and this pattern was to continue. Compared to the other sites, however, turnover was low. Also unlike the other sites, almost all terminations were self-initiated, a fact that attested to the success Site B had experienced in recruiting, screening, and hiring staff. At all times, the managers, instructors, and counselors were well qualified individuals with experience and attitudes appropriate to their jobs.

A third cohort, complete with a randomly assigned control group, was to be enrolled by the end of January, 1979. The director was concerned over meeting the specified quotas (90 interns and 55 controls) and initiated negotiations with a second feeder school. Largely as a result of his efforts, the third cohort grew to 106 interns and 60 controls.

The influx of the 106 new interns in January had effects that were apparent at the time of RMC's second visit in February, 1979. Some classes had to be held in a nearby community center because the CIP building was too small for the almost 200 interns enrolled. Unfortunately, crossing over from one building to the other provided interns with the temptation to cut classes or roam the streets, and attendance suffered as a result. Much of this behavior was reduced by an administrative "crackdown" involving strict enforcement of existing rules. Attendance and attitudes improved following this action, but the program's climate never quite regained the level it had reached prior to the entry of third-cohort interns--perhaps because the sheer numbers present precluded the level of individualized attention that had been possible earlier.

Counselors could not see interns as often as they liked, both because there were so many interns and because the new interns required extra attention in the beginning. In addition, the loss of several instructors made it necessary for counselors to fill in in the classrooms. Local OIC requisition procedures were affecting the CIP's acquisition of instructional materials. It was also proving difficult to find enough Hands-On placements, a problem aggravated by a lack of good public transportation near the CIP.

Despite these problems, the CIP was generally going very well. Program functions were clearly being performed. The staff had modified or dropped many of the OIC/A-provided "learning packets" developed in the prototype, replacing them with materials they had developed or identified themselves. Staff and intern morale were high, and interns were very vocal in their positive feelings about the CIP.

In late February, 1979, Site B held its first formal graduation ceremonies. Fourteen graduates were added to the eight who had completed the program earlier. A formal Parent-Teachers Association was formed in March. However, attendance began to decline. To combat this problem the CIP instituted a twice-daily attendance check and a policy of rewarding high attendance with field trips. Nevertheless, the problem persisted throughout the demonstration without responding to any of the several tactics employed to combat it.

The decline in attendance may have been an intern response to a decline in staff morale. On the third visit to Site B, in April, 1979, staff members complained about low salaries; excessive workloads; lack of time for thoughtful planning, program development, and getting to know interns well; lack of vacation time between sessions to recuperate from the heavy demands of the CIP; and uncontrollable vandalism. The director was aware of all these problems. He had requested OIC and OIC/A help with the vandalism problem, hoping to obtain a security guard. No funds could be made available for this purpose, however, and the problem persisted.

The time pressure of the demonstration made workloads heavy, and intersession breaks brief. Attempts to establish efficient procedures for getting substitute teachers from the LEA had not borne fruit. There were also strained relations between the counselors and the counseling supervisor that were exacerbated by OIC's reluctance to give the CIP director full autonomy in terminating ineffective staff members who had been drawn from OIC roles.

Despite these problems, program functions appeared to be performed adequately, if with less positive affect than was observed earlier. Interns still strongly endorsed the CIP.

In June, 1979, the CIP graduated another 35 interns, 14 (40%) of whom were accepted into colleges. As a result, the CIP director was approached by a number of other schools and by parents who wanted to send students not succeeding in the public schools to the CIP. Though LEA policies precluded transfers to the CIP from other than the designated feeder schools, this confirmation of community acceptance was welcome news.

The period between June and the December, 1979, site visit was marked by a series of break-ins, initial recruitment of the fourth cohort, and tremendous uncertainty regarding program extension beyond 1979. In fact, a number of staff members left the program. There were, however, no other significant events.

At the beginning of December, RMC visited the CIP a fourth time. The situation was much as it had been in April. Staff morale had improved, but still suffered from the same problems, except that the counseling supervisor had resigned and been replaced with a very popular and competent member of the original counseling staff. This had made a noticeable difference in counseling operations, but it had not alleviated problems of too much work, too little time, and too little pay. Members of the staff were showing signs of the familiar "burn-out" phenomenon. Nevertheless, program functions were being fulfilled and the climate was positive, on balance. The approval of the extension and the site's success in already having identified the necessary 75 new enrollees for the extension had relieved short-term anxieties about the future. (Site B was required to enroll only 75 interns for the extension because, with its large current enrollment, no more than that number could be accommodated.)

In February, 1980, the CIP graduated another eight interns, bringing the total to 61 graduates. Ninety-five percent of the 188 interns enrolled after intake of the final cohort were still active, though attendance hovered at about 60%. It continued to be difficult to procure Hands-On placements and to find time for visiting interns' homes, but the basic CIP functions were strong. Staff and intern morale had risen, and program climate was positive.

Site B's reputation for excellence was bringing large numbers of visitors to the program, e.g., there was a visit from the Ministry of Australian Education. In March, the site received an official White House commendation from the Assistant to the President for Domestic Affairs and Policy. The award was gratefully received by program personnel and boosted staff morale. Then, in April, the director announced his intention to resign, for reason of career advancement. RMC was visiting the site at the time.

The resignation of the director, whom interns and staff consistently credited as the most important factor in getting and keeping the CIP running, was a severe blow. Added to the approaching end of the demonstration period, his imminent departure created much anxiety about the CIP's future. The director's resignation coincided with a new rash of break-ins. During the previous month, there had been a break-in every week. During the RMC visit, the site was again broken into, with papers strewn about and desks rifled. The staff identified this act as the behavior of vandals outside the program--possibly terminated interns seeking revenge against the program. In addition, the site visitor's rental car was broken into. A suitcase, a briefcase, and the car's battery were stolen.

The climate of fear imposed on the CIP about this time was further compounded by the slashing of one staff member's tires, the smashing of another staff member's windshield, and the theft of yet another's hubcaps that occurred one week following the April site visit. The level of the staffs' intense personal dedication to the program was evidenced by their sheer endurance and determination to continue working under these circumstances. In fact, as is often the case, the series of calamities just described appeared to intensify the commitment of both the staff and interns to the program.

During the course of RMC's April visit, many changes were observed in program operations. Hands-On activities and home visits had increased; more staff time was available for instructional and counseling activities because recruiting had stopped; and the new interns were finally settled in their courses. Other program functions were operating well, but 42 interns had left since the last site visit (22%) and there was high anxiety about the implications of the director's resignation. The CIP participants knew the OIC had plans to appoint an acting director, but no one knew when. The attitude toward the CIP was very positive, but uncertainty dampened the overall climate.

While looking for a suitable permanent director, the local OIC gave its deputy executive director responsibility for the CIP. Later, a half-time interim acting director was assigned to the program. Both appointees were sincere in their desire to do a good job, but both they and others perceived their tenure at the CIP as temporary. The result was to lower the motivation and morale of the staff. In addition, staff attendance was sporadic or irregular. As one informant commented:

> What do you expect? We don't know what's going to happen. We don't even know if the place is going to be funded next year. But he's [the director] temporary and they [the interns] know it so there are no sanctions.... You can't blame them, some are just looking for jobs. Most of us, you know, mostly fear "who's coming next." We didn't entirely know how good he [the former director] really was. We knew he was good but, you know, only when he's gone do you begin to really appreciate him. We need a

> leader. Everyone knows he's [the interim director] a good man, he knows what to do but he wants to go back to his old job. There's nothing wrong with that, its just that everybody knows he's temporary so the interns don't care and don't think we care and there's no one to control the staff.

During the three months between RMC's fifth and sixth visits to Site B, operational mechanics were maintained, but program climate began to deteriorate. In addition to the impermanent, part-time leadership, the uncertainty of continuation beyond September contributed to the general malaise. Still, given the circumstances of no permanent director and the imminent termination of demonstration funding, staff morale was higher than might have been expected.

As tended always to be the case during the summer, attendance was poor--ranging from 30% to 50%. Most of the staff agreed that the summer program should be radically modified in the future for the following reasons: poor attendance, staff "burn-out," and "just being realistic." None of the instructors suggested abolishing the summer session. Instead, suggestions such as work-study programs were made "so as not to lose contact" with the interns over the summer.

Summary

An overview of CIP implementation at Site B shows that 297 interns enrolled, 69 graduated, and more than 40 remained in the program at the end of the demonstration period. Staff turnover was quite good in comparison to other YEDPA programs. The site went through a difficult period in its early days but, after about 10 months, appeared to have effected a fully functional program. The resignation of the original director in April, 1980, and OIC's subsequent slowness in finding a permanent successor, led to deterioration of the CIP's climate, low intern attendance, and less adequate mechanical functioning at the time of RMC's final site visit.

Site C

Site C is located in a city of approximately 32,000 residents in a semi-rural area. The city's main street divides it economically. Upper-middle class citizens live primarily on the south side and lower socioeconomic class citizens on the north side of the town. Many middle-income individuals have been economically "forced" to live in the suburbs.

The poorer section of the city has well maintained single family dwellings with some substandard housing and very few houses that are boarded up. Economically, the city depends heavily on one major company that provides jobs for 22,000 persons. According to a study by the local planning agency, adult unemployment for the county is low. But in the city itself, adult unemployment is 32% and youth unemployment reaches 80%.

Many CIP staff members and ex-staff members commented on the "conservative" nature of the community. One staff member said, "Both the Black and white communities are provincial in their attitudes."

Two of the white staff members from the south side perceived no real provincialism in the community; however, they also said they spent very little time in the north end of the city. The majority of the Black staff members described the community as "up south"--that is, the city is physically located in the north but the community climate is often like that in "the deep rural south." One individual said: "When you call to help set up a Hands-On for the intern and the voice on the other end says something like 'those people,' you know who you're dealin' with." Ex-career developers have commented on the reluctance of community members to assist dropouts in general and minorities in particular in "anti-poverty" programs.

Most of the interns complained about the pressures they experienced at their former high school: administrators were "lookin' to throw me out all the time," instructors "just not carin' about nobody," and fellow students who would lure them away from the classroom to "get high and just hang out."

Many young men in the CIP have police records. They characterized the police as unfair and often corrupt. One intern complained about being arrested for trespassing on private property--describing it as a form of harassment. Another intern described being physically assaulted in the local police station after being arrested for participating in a minor riot following a basketball game.

In September, 1977, when OIC/A announced that funds were expected to become available for CIP replication and requested interested local OICs to begin preparing feasibility studies, the Site C OIC responded immediately. LEA officials helped significantly in the preparation of the feasibility study, giving the OIC a letter from the superintendent promising support and an analysis of the potential intern population. The feasibility study indicated that the LEA, which had only one high school (with a 23.8% dropout rate), had identified 144 in-school students and 400 dropouts as potential CIP interns. The feasibility study also stated that the "teachers' union supports an alternative learning environment and it is expected that they will sign off on certain conditions in their contract with the school district to allow the CIP program [to operoperate]." It did not indicate whether this expectation was based on direct contact with the union.

When the local OIC was informed on 1 December that its proposal had been accepted (although funding was not yet available), it was also asked to recruit a staff for training by OIC/A in mid-December. In a two-week period, approximately 400 persons applied for the 22 positions advertised. The staff the OIC executive director was able to assemble on such short notice was nearly complete, but seriously deficient in leadership and other skills. The person eventually appointed director had not, in fact, applied for the directorship, but for the position of counseling supervisor. He had no previous managerial or administrative experience and lacked the academic qualifications specified by OIC/A. Neither the instructional nor the counseling supervisor had any supervisory experience, although the counseling supervisor did have a master's degree, counseling experience in community mental health, and extensive community contacts. Of the 20 staff members hired by the time of the OIC/A training, about half had been working at the local OIC. Staff training was conducted in a nearby city by OIC/A personnel on 19-23 December.

Although the feasibility study identified a building for the CIP, the facility needed extensive remodeling. It was an old three-story house with small rooms and narrow stairs. The remodeling created small offices for the administrative and counseling staff. The classrooms were spread over all three stories of the building. The room that served as the Resource Center was in the basement.

The CIP staff moved into the building on 22 February, 1978. On the next day, the first cohort of 30 interns (there were no controls) entered the CIP. All 30 were actual dropouts, as arrangements for enrolling in-school youth had not been finalized with the LEA.

As the CIP staff entered into discussions with school administrators about recruiting details, the local teachers' union learned of the plans and protested. Concerned that the teachers' union would make trouble, the high school principal and counselors became very reluctant to help the CIP. On 20 March, the LEA superintendent officially informed the CIP that LEA collaboration was suspended as a result of union pressure.

The teachers' union felt their contract with the LEA made them the "sole service providers" and gave them authority over hiring and other personnel practices of any agency delivering instructional services in the city. The main demands of the teachers' union were that they would have to participate in any CIP-LEA agreement and that the CIP would have to hire all instructors and counselors from union ranks in accordance with the seniority of available personnel. This position, of course, was unacceptable to the CIP since the program could not afford to pay union wages. It is also important to the program to employ instructors and counselors who are young, caring, and of the same ethnicity as the interns.

The local OIC was given until the 26th of April by OIC/A to secure a formal agreement with the board of education. If they failed, their contract would be terminated. As the impasse with the teachers' union continued, the deadline was extended first to 12 May, then to 15 June, and finally to 16 July. Eventually OIC/A's project director negotiated personally with the high school principal and the president of the teachers' union on 10 July, 1978. The outcome was an agreement by which the CIP would hire one union instructor for every 25 students referred by the school and employ an additional union staff member in the capacity of school coordinator. All union members were to be paid by the CIP, but at their LEA rates, which were about 40% above the CIP salary scale.

During the several months of negotiations leading to school board and union agreement to cooperate with the CIP, the staff was working with the initial cohort, completing curriculum materials, and making contacts in the area for Hands-On placements. Renovations to the building were continuing. Recruiting arrangements were also being made with three additional school districts. When the LEA approval became official on 13 July, recruiting began again. Even with the LEA cooperating, however, the CIP was unable to find enough applicants to meet enrollment quotas. In October, NIE and DOL granted Site C permission to enroll a second cohort without controls, even though it was substantially smaller than the desired size. Immediately, 46 new interns were taken into the program, bringing the official total enrollment to 76. Thirty-six of the new interns came from the original school district, and 10 from one of the new districts.

RMC made its first data-collection to Site C at the end of October, 1978. During this initial visit it was learned that staff members had lost much of the enthusiasm they had had immediately after being trained by OIC/A. They attributed their loss of enthusiasm in part to the delays in negotiations with the school board and union. There was also evidence of antagonism and general divisivness involving various staff members and the administration.

Instruction in academic subjects was being conducted primarily in a traditional manner, with lecturing and large-group instruction. Learning packets and individual diagnosis, as well as small-group and individualized instruction, were observed periodically. With few exceptions, however, they merely supplemented the more traditional approaches.

A few classes were observed in which interns worked exclusively with learning packets and at their own pace. The packets had been modified to eliminate inappropriate content or had been developed by Site C staff members. Instructors who used the packets exclusively expressed the opinion that their interns were not taking their learning seriously. In a few classes, texts and workbooks were used to supplement the packets. Role playing was also observed in a few instances.

The CCS classes were taught by teams of counselors, instructors, and career developers who used the learning packets. Role playing and problem solving activities related to "self-awareness and careers" were incorporated into CCS instruction. Interns were taken on a number of field trips related to careers and academics, (e.g., neighboring colleges and vocational schools) as well as to cultural enrichment. Resource persons visited the CCS classes to share information about their careers and the world of work.

Interns were positive about the program, especially in comparison to their former high schools. Staff members, however, perceived several growing problems. The OIC executive director, having sensed that the CIP director was providing inadequate leadership, had assumed some of his duties. The OIC board also insisted on being involved in CIP decisions, causing delays and confusion. The CIP director had demoted the counseling supervisor and assumed her role in the counseling department.

The appointment of four LEA personnel to the CIP--three instructors and a school coordinator (who dealt only with the original LEA)--also created difficulties. The arrangement whereby LEA personnel would be paid at significantly higher rates than the regular CIP staff members, for the same work, caused resentment. The regular and LEA staff members did not communicate or coordinate well. It was also confusing to have one school coordinator to deal with the original LEA and another working with the new LEAs that had become involved. Moreover, the regular CIP staff members felt the LEA was not being as helpful as it should have been. Finally, the LEA-appointed school coordinator was also the teachers' union president, and his avowed interest was in keeping a close watch on the CIP to make sure it did not take jobs away from union members.

Staff morale was also affected by what was perceived as excessive OIC/A and federal-agency involvement in CIP operations. They especially resented OIC/A's "intrusion" during the negotiations to get LEA and union approval because the "deal they cut" led to having the LEA personnel in the CIP. Furthermore, the concessions made by OIC/A were ones they had earlier specifically instructed the local OIC not to make under any circumstances. It was the latter factor that was primarily responsible for the resentment, but without these concessions it is highly probable the CIP would have been closed down altogether. The staff also harbored bad feelings about the pressure NIE and DOL had exerted, through OIC/A, to get the LEA and union approvals and to recruit. They felt, too, that the federal agencies had been ambiguous about cohort sizes and entry dates. The delay between recruitment and authorization for intake had caused, in the staff's view, the loss of a "significant number of interns."

During November, December, and January, the major emphasis was on recruiting for the third cohort under the pressure of the 31 January, 1979, deadline for enrolling 90 interns and 55 controls. With the addition of three new school districts in the county to the catchment area, Site C was able to meet the deadline. In the first week of February, 95 new interns were enrolled, bringing the total number of interns to 149.

During this same period, however, the local OIC and OIC/A realized that radical action had to be taken in regard to CIP leadership. With OIC/A's endorsement, the OIC executive director temporarily relieved the CIP director of his duties and took on his responsibilities herself. The former director was given the title "Administrative Intern" and continued to work in the program. The OIC executive director delegated many leadership duties to the school liaison officer, who managed the CIP's daily operation until the beginning of March.

RMC's second visit to Site C occurred at the end of February, 1979. The influx of new interns had made the CIP facility very crowded, and renovations were still not complete. Instruction had assumed an even more traditional look with emphasis on lecturing, textbooks, and very little individualized attention. Instructors said this was because of the large number of interns, though class sizes were observed to be the same as on the previous visit. In the counseling unit, most activity was centered around the paperwork and planning involved in processing the new interns into the program. Counselors were frustrated that they could spend little time individually with interns, getting to know them. Hands-On placements were also difficult to find. Disposition conferences had been suspended in November, due to recruiting activities, but there were plans to begin holding them again soon.

The second visit alsc revealed a further reduction of staff enthusiasm. Dissatisfaction was expressed regarding the CIP administration and the changes in staff roles that had recently been made. The majority of staff members felt a need for greater administrative autonomy for the program. In their opinion, the local OIC was reluctant to "let go." One group suggested that the director's lack of authority to hire and fire staff was the basis for many of the difficulties at the site. Another group referred to a lack of management skills as the source of the administration's problems. In addition, a few members of the staff--both Black and white--expressed some discomfort working under the direction of a Black man. One the other hand, "race issues have been used to obfuscate real inadequacies," and individuals were on "power trips," according to a reliable former staff member.

Grievances about issues ranging from insufficient supplies to promised raises that never materialized were rarely addressed by management, according to several individuals. Resentment occasionally surfaced between the two LEA-employed instructors and the rest of the CIP staff regarding salary differences, fringe benefits, working hours, and attitudes. Inadequate communication among staff members made it extremely difficult for some individuals to function efficiently in their roles.

Staff members were fearful that the funding agency would terminate the program when recruitment goals could not be attained. Internal strife was rampant, as were tension and frustration among the staff. One instructor echoed the sentiments of the majority: "It's hard to wake up in the morning not knowing if your job will even be there from day to day." He added that the local OIC had placed pressure on staff to "shape up or ship out," leading to an atmosphere where "everyone is minding everyone else's business." In fact, many individuals were observed spending an inordinate amount of time recording voluminous notes about each other "to cover themselves." This procedure was referred to as "documentation" by the local OIC and was viewed as an important step in the termination of staff. There were also a few individuals "waiting in the wings," convinced of their ability to assume the administrative roles in the program.

The effects of these problems had significant impacts on the interns. Many interns were given class schedules that did not include the courses they required for graduation. Frustrated, two interns commented, "I'm bein' ripped off again. They're doin' the same thing to me as _____ (the high school)."

A few instructors discouraged interns from pursuing their career interests without suggesting alternatives. One instructor acquired from the LEA commented: "It's irresponsible what they're doing, counseling them all to go to college. Take _____, she wanted to go into computer science. The first thing I say is what's her background? It takes math and she hasn't got it.... There are only three students in the whole school that are college material."

The lack of leadership and communication, and the fear and frustration among the staff were reflected in intern behavior. High absenteeism, periodic altercations, derogatory graffiti on lavatory walls, smoking on the stairs and in the corridors, and other behaviors characteristic of the neighborhood high school were observed at the site.

Staff attitudes toward the goals of the CIP and their commitment to helping interns, however, remained generally positive. On both of the first two site visits, dedication to treating interns as "whole persons," helping them attain their high school diplomas, and assisting them develop career awareness was expressed--"in spite of it all."

On 2 March, 1979, the original director was reinstated on a provisional basis. Unfortunately, however, he was no more effective during this probationary period than he had been earlier. A review of the program by an OIC board member led to his permanent resignation at the end of March. The OIC board member who conducted the review took over as interim director until a permanent replacement could be found. He was well qualified and provided a boost to staff morale.

The third RMC visit, in May, 1979, occurred a month after the interim director had taken over. Recruitment for a new permanent director had yielded two finalists, both of whom were adequately qualified and attractive candidates. During RMC's visit, final selection interviews were underway, with OIC/A participating.

In the CIP, intern absenteeism and attitudes reflected earlier difficulties. At the start of one day only 24 interns were present, although enrollment was officially at 110. Class attendance ranged from 5 to 9, while rosters showed from 10 to 20 interns officially enrolled. Counselors were doing little but the paperwork required by the sending school districts. Instruction was perfunctory. Some instructors were missing due to long-term illnesses or plain absenteeism. No disposition conferences had been held since October, and there was little coordination among staff members.

Despite these problems, staff morale was on the rise. All staff members were impressed by the skill and style of the interim director. He had held staff meetings to get communications started. He had instituted new procedures to encourage and document attendance. A sense of direction and purpose was evident. Steps had been taken to replace or find substitutes for staff members who had resigned or were absent or on leave. A first group of 10 interns had just graduated. OIC/A had been invited to give training, and the training had been well received. Though the CIP was not functioning well, it was showing real and increasing improvement.

A new permanent director was hired on 14 May, 1979. She was an experienced secondary school teacher who had worked with disadvantaged young people. She also had a strong, outgoing personality and a vision for the program. Her first actions were to find out as much as possible about program operations and problems by observing and interviewing staff members individually and in groups. She developed specific plans of action to address the various issues confronting the CIP. These included regular departmental and whole-staff meetings, informal staff lunches every Thursday, refinements to the interim director's initiatives regarding attendance and retention, organizing the site Advisory Council, and cementing relations with the LEAs. Within two weeks of her arrival, the ineffectual instructional supervisor resigned and a search for a new one was started. Other staff slots were also filled and substitutes were hired to fill in for the instructors on medical leave.

The staff responded positively to the new director. Though they remained somewhat skeptical of her ability to improve things--because they had heard such promises before--the staff members reported feeling that if there was any chance, the new director would be able to capitalize on it.

At this time, negotiations were proceeding about the extension of the demonstration. While the other sites were told they could expect to be extended, a decision about Site C was held off until an October program review by DOL. DOL visited at the end of June to take a preliminary look at the program. The CIP staff and interns felt the visitors showed little interest in their program. They stayed two hours and left without requesting any information they had not already received through OIC/A. The director stated, in her June, 1979, monthly report, "We have made many changes and worked very hard. It was frustrating to all of us not to have the opportunity to demonstrate our gains. The visit left us with an empty feeling and an idea that perhaps DOL had already decided our fate," though this was not the fact.

During the summer and early fall of 1979, Site C was under great pressure to get the program up to par. One of the instructors was promoted to instructional supervisor on 25 June. He immediately began organizing an instructional planning and record-keeping system. He also instituted staff training sessions on a number of topics. Extra-curricular activities were organized to motivate interns, and part-time summer jobs were made available through an arrangement with the CETA prime sponsor. New policies regarding student and staff conduct were promulgated by the director. All staff vacancies were filled. In general, the period leading up to the October DOL review was one of intense revision, reform, and upgrading of operations, including frequent contact with OIC/A for consultation and training.

A review of the CIP's building occupancy permit in September disclosed that, by fire department standards, the facility was unacceptable for more than 130 persons. With plans to recruit a new cohort when DOL's approval for extended operation was granted, the old building would be inadequate. A search was begun for a new building. One was found and renovated in October. The CIP moved there immediately. Recruitment was also begun on the assumption the October review would be positive.

On 30 October, 1979, DOL paid its long-awaited visit to Site C, and found the program acceptably improved. Intensified recruitment for a new cohort of 100 interns and 75 controls began. By this time agreements had been made with five LEAs, and the staff anticipated an easier time meeting recruitment quotas. In addition, the approval from DOL, the new building, and the months of reform activities contributed to higher staff morale and optimism.

RMC visited again in December, 1979. Enrollment was down to 49, but attendance was up. The new building was a definite improvement. Instruction showed the characteristics of the CIP design. The counseling staff was involved in recruitment virtually full-time, but there was no alternative if a new cohort was to be enrolled. Staff morale was high, owing to the improved leadership situation. There were still some problems, but they seemed minor compared to the situation earlier.

Recruitment for the extension-period cohort was going slowly, as the LEAs were proving reluctant to refer in-school youth and the school coordinator refused to deal with any LEAs but the original, where he was still officially employed. Lists of actual dropouts provided by the LEAs had not led to many recruits. The original LEA was also requiring a burdensome reexamination of CIP staff certification. However, it was being very helpful in supplying substitutes, lunches for interns, and excess furniture and instructional materials. The local OIC, satisfied with the new CIP director's performance, was giving the CIP more autonomy.

In January and February, 1980, Site C enrolled 62 new interns, and a control group of 29 was established. Though these numbers were lower than DOL had stipulated for the extension, DOL and NIE accepted them. Attendance was high and there were 94 interns enrolled. Some intern behavior problems had surfaced because, according to the director, the new interns were younger and less mature than the old interns. Money also became a problems in the early months of 1980 because DOL and NIE had not yet released the extension funds to OIC/A.

In April, 1980, RMC visited Site C for the fifth time. Attendance was reported above 70%. Instruction was observed to be appropriately individualized. However, the LEA-supplied instructors were felt to be less sensitive to interns, causing friction. The counseling department was very heavily involved with paperwork for internal purposes and to meet the reporting requirements of the five sending LEAs. As a result, there was too little time for actual counseling. The new instructional supervisor was felt by the counselors to be insensitive to interns and not supportive of "humanistic" approaches. There was evidence of staff "burn-out" in the complaints staff members had about "management's" high expectations, delays in funding, insufficient supplies, low pay, lack of adequate vacation time, and other issues. The climate was not generally as positive as it had been in December, though it was nowhere near as depressed as a year earlier. Nevertheless, the CIP appeared to be functioning adequately with allowance for the pressures of no funding since December and tiredness among the staff members.

RMC's sixth and final visit to Site C was in August 1980--just a few weeks before the demonstration period ended. The most dramatic event of the summer happened while RMC was on site. During that visit, the CIP director, the instructional supervisor, and the reading specialist departed. Their resignations were partially motivated by career-advancement opportunities at other institutions, but the impending end of the demonstration period also played an important role. The exodus of these individuals had a strong effect on the program. Staff members and interns both tried to face the future optimistically, but there was a real pall of concern that affected instruction, counseling, and program climate. Whereas, on earlier visits, there had been frustration at obstacles combined with resolve to overcome them, there was now a fatalistic resignation as to what might happen next. The site visitors could see standard operating procedures beginning to be circumvented or ignored. Attendance was down significantly from the earlier levels and interns displayed little enthusiasm. Staff members performed their duties mechanically but without spirit. There was form but not substance.

There is evidence that new leaders were able to revitalize the program once more. RMC was unable to verify this turnaround by first-hand observation, however.

Summary

The history of the Site C CIP was a checkered one indeed. Inadequate leadership and difficulties with the LEA and teachers' union in the beginning resulted in a weak program through the first 14 or 15 months. Capable and experienced leaders then turned the situation around. During the last 10 or 12 months of the demonstration period, the program was close to achieving full implementation. However, an uncertain future and more attractive job opportunities elsewhere led key staff members to resign, leaving the program with appropriate structure and form but an uncertain future. By the end of the demonstration period, Site C had enrolled 233 interns and graduated 40.

Site D

Site D is located in a large urban center with 1,500,000 residents. The greater metropolitan area has a population of 4.35 million. The majority of the city's population is Black, representing every socioeconomic level. The city's economy is heavily dependent on manufacturing. Unemployment is high among the 16-22 year old group, averaging 26% for the entire city and rising to 56% in the inner city.

The area the OIC picked for the CIP is an inner-city neighborhood characterized by high population density, poverty, and an array of social problems. Housing conditions range from standard to substandard. There are several boarded-up homes throughout the neighborhood. The area is one of the "toughest" parts of the city--often referred to as the "DMZ" (for demilitarized zone). Gang wars and struggles for power between pimps and drug dealers erupted in bursts of urban terrorism during the sixties. Today much of the overt and arbitrary violence has diminished, but illicit activities remain firmly rooted in the area and periodically produce waves of violence. Many young people know or associate with gang members, if they are not actually in the gangs. Youth spend much of their leisure time swapping stories about "gang happenings" such as shootouts, brawls, looting, and so on. The cancellation of a contemporary film that popularized gang activity is indicative of the city's fear of any large-scale revival of gang activities, according to a high-ranking city official.

The police do not patrol the area regularly in the winter, but in the summer "they're all over the place." Many of the males in the area have police records. Bitter complaints about how young people are treated by the police are common. "You gotta watch out for them, they'll pull you right off the street and slap you across the head for looking sideways around here, 'cause they're as scared as we are."

The public schools are typical of inner-city high schools. Observed in one school were students lined up along the corridor walls, staring into space, completely "burnt out." This school in particular, only a few blocks from the CIP, has a reputation for violence. Fights break out every day in the school building. Once a month some student is arrested for assault with a deadly weapon with intent to kill, and occasionally there are killings on the school grounds. It is not surprising that much peer pressure among youth works against staying in school.

The feasibility study prepared by the OIC reports a city-wide average high school dropout rate of 14.8%. In the LEA regions the CIP was to serve, the student population of 47,974 was 95% Black, very similar to the case in the prototype site. Strong support for the CIP was inferred from a recent LEA publication promoting the concept of alternative education with a "world-of-work" orientation, as well as from a letter of goodwill from the superintendent.

The OIC was able to assemble an almost complete staff through its own personnel office. Most of the counseling and support staff and the instructional supervisor were transferred from existing OIC programs, while the instructional staff was recruited through resumes on file. However, a CIP director could not be found by the OIC before the OIC/A training conducted the week following Christmas, 1977. Near the end of that training period, however, one of the OIC/A trainers was hired to be the CIP director. She had not had supervisory experience nor had she worked in an educational institution, but she was a native of the Site D city. A school coordinator was not hired until June, 1978. He was an ex-LEA counselor who knew the school system, including the proposed feeder schools, well. The need to have someone with this background was the reason for the delay in hiring a school coordinator.

For about three and a half months, the CIP staff occupied a local OIC facility. They worked on developing the curriculum with little additional guidance from OIC/A. They retrospectively reported that this period gave them "time to get on each others backs--because there weren't any interns." In mid-April, the CIP was relocated to a more suitable facility that was to remain its home throughout the demonstration period.

The local OIC executive director and the CIP director attempted to secure a resolution from the LEA during this period. The local school board official they first contacted had not been informed of the CIP by the superintendent. He thus was first made aware of the program by a phone call in which the CIP simply announced its presence in the district. The local board official complained about not being approached earlier or asked to assist in the development of curriculum to meet accreditation requirements. NIE's deadline (26 April, 1978) passed and no resolution had been obtained. OIC/A requested and received an extension from NIE. The local LEA administrators were sympathetic to the notion of the program, however, and OIC/A met directly with the board on 5 May. This meeting led to securing a school board resolution on 10 May, 1978.

With the way cleared to opening the CIP, first-cohort interns were pretested on 24 May and received an orientation on 30 May and 1 June, 1978. Classes began the following week. There were 23 treatment students and no control students. Although the LEA approval allowed the CIP to recruit in three schools, all interns had been out of school prior to enrolling in the CIP. The school coordinator had begun contacting the schools, but access and cooperation were limited because the schools were closing for summer vacation. Recruitment thus had to focus on non-school sources. The entire staff canvassed the neighborhoods around the CIP door-to-door and many contacts were made through churches and social service agencies. A significant factor affecting recruitment was reported to have been competition from other youth programs.

By late September it was clear Site D would not be able to recruit enough applicants to form treatment and control groups for the second cohort. Permission was sought and received from NIE to enroll all interested applicants and, on 16 October, 1978, Site D enrolled 68 interns. Again, all were dropouts; none had transferred from the LEA schools. Also in October, the CIP schedule was changed so classes were 90 minutes long, rather than 50. This change assured that interns would have adequate "seat time" to meet LEA graduation requirements, but it made the school day run from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Attendance and staff morale were negatively affected.

RMC conducted its first data-collection visit to Site D in November, 1978. Two things were immediately evident. First, intern attendance was low. Ninety-one interns had enrolled in June and October, but RMC observed that no more than 25 were present at any given time. Through one afternoon, no more than nine interns were seen in the building. At the same time, Site D's official monthly progress report for November, 1978, indicated that 47 interns were still enrolled.

Second, there was extreme factionalism among the staff members. The director had isolated herself in her office, making only brief appearances on her way in and out. She was also out of the building frequently to attend meetings at the OIC or to make contacts in the community. She administered the program by memoranda stating policies on every issue that came up, policies she developed by herself or in consultation with only the instructional supervisor. The director would not communicate with staff members directly, insisting they "go through the channels," which meant through the supervisors. However, only the instructional supervisor enjoyed the director's confidence. The counseling supervisor was not involved in decision making, but became merely a conduit for the director's memos.

The non-management staff members were divided into two main groups: those who tried to be "on the good side" of the instructional supervisor by agreeing with her positions and opinions, and those who tried to oppose her. There were also a few staff members who isolated themselves and tried to do their work with minimal contact with either camp. Staff morale was very low, program climate was abysmal, and group cohesiveness was non-existent. There was some attempt by staff members to perform their functions, and instruction had the mechanical appearance of the CIP design. However, the low intern attendance meant little actual instruction or counseling was going on.

Both the director and the instructional supervisor lacked appropriate qualifications for their jobs. These deficiencies in training and experience compounded the problems that arose from their poor interpersonal skills. In addition, the OIC executive director, by his own admission, preferred to "manage by exception." Thus he did not closely monitor or support the CIP's development and only became aware of the situation there when reports of problems reached him. He told RMC that he wanted to let things "sort themselves out" without his involvement. The problems with CIP leadership thus became very large before the Site D OIC became involved.

OIC/A became aware of the CIP's situation through the monthly reports showing attendance problems and through frequent visits. In December, 1978, OIC/A finally prevailed on the Site D OIC to remove the director and instructional supervisor. When that was done, the OIC/A deputy demonstration director moved to Site D to take personal control of the CIP. He instituted major changes in procedures, insisted on staff communication and coordination, and began an intensive training program for the staff.

The intervention by OIC/A "turned the site around." The removal of the director and instructional supervisor effected an immediate improvement in staff morale. According to one staff member, "It's like a great burden has been lifted from us all. We talk to each other now, have you noticed?"

The school coordinator was informed (as he should have been months earlier) that the CIP serves potential as well as actual dropouts. (His misconception regarding this issue, not surprisingly, had seriously handicapped his effectiveness as a recruiter.) Finally, the credit awarding policy was revamped, resulting in the return of 50-minute classes. OIC/A also launched a successful "media blitz" to attract interns for the third cohort.

The changes initiated by OIC/A were evident at the time of RMC's second site visit in February, 1979. The new instructional supervisor was one of the former instructors. She was strongly endorsed by her peers and had extensive experience in education. She worked well with the staff and was perceived as a good resource and leader. The counseling supervisor had become more active in managing the counseling unit. Though her unassertive manner and feelings of relative inexperience kept her from establishing strong leadership, she was perceived as a good coordinator and worked with the interim (OIC/A) director and the instructional supervisor to develop staff cohesion.

As a result of these significant changes, the program was making rapid progress in implementation. Staff morale was very high. Intern attendance was averaging close to 70%. Program climate was positive, caring, and supportive. The massive recruiting campaign of December and January to meet the deadline for 90 interns and 55 controls by 31 January, 1979, had resulted in the enrollment of 97 new interns, making a total of 129 interns. The new arrangements with the LEA had led to this cohort being about equally divided between dropouts and transfers from other schools.

The case load of the counseling unit was high because there was only one counselor and one career developer. Suitable replacements for others who had resigned during the stressful earlier period or to take other higher-paying jobs had not yet been found. However, though the workload was extremely heavy and precluded giving enough personal attention to interns, even these two staff members felt very enthusiastic about how things were going.

The large size of the new cohort was disruptive in many ways. Particularly noteworthy were the dress and demeanor of the new interns. While dress codes had not been strictly enforced prior to entry of the third cohort, first- and second-cohort interns had become socialized to the norms of the program during their period of participation. The entry of the third cohort produced a dramatic change.

Intern apparel and style of walking were indicative of some of their values and attitudes. Many of the new interns emulated role models from "blaxploitation" films such as Superfly. For instance, they wore wide-brimmed hats, trench coats, and flashy jewelry. As one staff member phrased it, "they got that syncopated walk down." A number of the older interns from the first and second cohorts, however, mimicked the behavior of the new interns to ridicule their behavior. The attitude toward the dress code was relaxed, bordering on total non-enforcement. A few staff members asked interns to remove their hats or combs from their hair, but the majority either did not notice or ignored the interns' appearance, rather than using the situation to reinforce world-of-work values and behaviors. It was apparently hoped that as interns "grew into" the attitudes and behaviors expected in the program, they would internalize the program norms with respect to dress and other world-of-work behaviors.

A member of the clerical staff who displayed concern about the issue commented:

> You just have to keep reminding them about the hat situation. That's part of going to employment.... That's where the career comes in 'cause you go into an interview with your hat on and they don't really want to talk to you.... Some of those hats they wear here--big...Barcellonies--you can't wear that to an interview... that's part of their personality. They tell us, "If I take this off, half of me is left." They don't realize it yet but that's the half of them that they're gonna have to leave behind.

In mid-March the new director joined the CIP. She had been an active educational administrator in the area for a number of years. She knew what she wanted the CIP to be, and she had extensive community contacts. Her leadership style was inclusive and participatory. She shared and delegated authority as much as possible to reinforce staff ownership and commitment. When RMC visited next, in May, 1979, the improvements noted in February had continued to strengthen the program. The effects of higher staff morale and more coordinated operations had brought about marked differences in intern attitudes as well. Unfortunately, many of the new interns enrolled in January had begun to leave the CIP. In the pressure of recruitment to meet the DOL January deadline, an OIC/A report to DOL later stated, "the sites relaxed normal screening procedures... [leading to] a disproportionate number of interns...who are probably not ideal candidates for the program" (OIC/A memo to DOL, 31 July, 1979). This characterization evidently applied to the new interns' motivation to attend, and was reflected in enrollment and attendance rates throughout 1979.

The director had insisted on strict enforcement of intern conduct and dress standards and the interns had accepted them. As a whole, the interns seemed more mature about and committed to career goals. They took the CIP and their own activities more seriously.

A different relationship with the LEA had also emerged. The interim (OIC/A) director had renegotiated several points in the arrangement with the LEA, and the new director had extended the relationship considerably by maintaining frequent contact with the LEA regional assistant superintendent. The director felt the LEA had been very generous in offering substantive assistance, such as access to LEA resources. Overall, at the May, 1979, visit, the CIP appeared well on the road to full recovery from the operational nadir of December, 1978.

Over the summer of 1979, the CIP ran a reduced program to accommodate interns' needs for summer jobs. Arrangements were made with several summer youth programs that allowed interns to attend the CIP in the morning and work in the afternoon. In September, the CIP reopened at the same time as the public schools.

RMC visited again in December, 1979, after approval of the extension of the demonstration through September, 1980. Though there had been high attrition as described earlier, about 65 interns from the first three cohorts were still active, staff and intern morale were high, program climate was very positive, and program functions were operating very well. The staff enthusiastically endorsed the new director. Her leadership was firmly established and her style was compatible with staff members expectations. Though a few staff members expressed the wish that the director would reduce the amount of time she spent away from the CIP, this comment was made in a wistful, not dissatisfied, manner. These staff members also recognized that the director's role involved much contact in the community and many meetings at the OIC.

The interns were preoccupied, at this time, with the extensive development of school clubs and intern council elections. Clubs included chorus ensemble, newspaper, thinking man's games, cultural club, social club, yearbook, human relations, skating, and so on. The student council meeting RMC observed was highly animated--campaign speeches, posters, and various political machinations were observed throughout the visit. One of the supervisors pointed out the difference she observed in the current president from his early days in the program. "He was the one _____ fought at the basketball game. He wanted to take over the CIP but _____ wasn't about to let him. Now he's president running for a second term. I guess he really did take over eventually, but what a difference from fists to this." Another staff member invited this same intern to her house for lunch with her husband and said, "I laid the table out with silverware, napkins, and china, and served lunch..._____ sat down and told us during lunch that before this he had only known hamburgers for lunch. Then, he began asking me what each kind of silverware was used for. From then on we got along real well and look how he's turned out."

There was little anxiety about recruiting enough applicants for the extension-period treatment and control groups. Under a new school coordinator, recruitment was very well organized and systematic, and relations with the feeder schools had progressed to the point where CIP teams were allowed to set up booths on campus and to make announcements on the schools' PA systems telling students where they could talk to CIP recruiters. The CIP was also receiving strong public endorsements from influential community leaders, and informal community networks were spreading the message that the CIP was a good place to enroll. Thus, in December 1979, the Site D CIP was fully functional and eager to proceed with a new cohort during the extension period. The only persistent problem related to staff turnover as higher salaries in school districts continued to attract instructors away from the CIP.

An OIC/A Career Intern Program Conference was held in the Site D community at the time of the December site visit. The staff believed that the conference gave them a "boost in credibility" with the educational community. One of the local school board officials confirmed this view with the following comment: "We consider OIC-CIP part of our public school system. They provide services which we cannot provide. Public school systems cannot reach all students. There is a need for alternative, community-based programs like CIP." Moreover, all staff members agreed that the conference would help ensure future funding from the sponsoring agencies. Their views were supported by the praise and support of school board officials, local universities, the governor's office, local clergy, the evaluators, and the sponsors at the conference.

In February, 1980, Site D officially enrolled 130 new interns for the extension period, bringing the intern population to 183. (Actually, the new interns had been brought in gradually as they became available throughout November, December, and January.) RMC visited a month later and found the program in full operation. Attendance was at 70%, where it stabilized with only minor fluctuations for the rest of the demonstration. Staff members had continued to move on to better-paying positions, but well qualified people were found to replace them, usually fairly soon. As new staff members came in, they sometimes complained about the lack of resources, but they seemed resigned to this as an endemic situation in social-service programs. Staff morale remained high. An official parent group had been activated, and parents were seen actively seeking to assist in the program, especially by keeping pressure on interns to attend.

RMC's final visit in August, 1980, found much the same situation, though the enrollment was down because many interns did not want to go to school during the summer. Both interns and staff members were enthusiastic and working hard. One of the "old" staff members commented, "It's smooth sailing now," as she recalled the first year and a half of the CIP. Staff members had plans for trying new approaches to the summer program to raise enrollment, such as a work-study arrangement. There continued to be dissatisfaction with the salary schedule and the CIP calendar. School personnel, went the reasoning, need more vacation than two weeks a year to recover from the stress of working with youth, particularly youth with the kinds of problems CIP interns bring to the program. The LEA regional assistant superintendent also commented that she just did not know how the CIP could get people to work for the salaries they paid, which she felt were 10% to 15% lower than LEA salaries for a much shorter work year. "But they do, and it's a credit to their dedication," the official concluded.

Summary

The CIP in Site D had a tumultuous beginning year, ending with the dismissal of the original leadership and the program on the verge of collapse. Direct intervention from OIC/A, however, turned the situation around and a new director was found. Under her leadership the CIP achieved full operation within a few months, and maintained it through the demonstration period. Over the 33-month period, 318 interns enrolled, 58 graduated, and 73 remained in the program at the end of the demonstration period.

IV. IMPACT OF THE CIP ON PARTICIPATING INTERNS

The primary goals of the CIP are to help students earn their high school diplomas and obtain meaningful employment. En route to reaching these ultimate objectives, it is expected that students will improve their achievement levels in the basic skill areas, acquire information about career opportunities, learn about career planning, and enhance their self concepts. The program's success in achieving both its intermediate and ultimate objectives is considered in the following discussion.

Three cohorts of interns (Cohorts II, III, and IV) were studied at each of the four replication sites. Entry dates for Cohort II varied from site to site, but midtests were administered six months after entry, and posttests an additional six months later. The third and fourth cohorts at all sites entered at about the end of January. They were midtested near the end of May (after four months in the program) to avoid the summer when attendance was poor and attrition high. Cohort III was posttested 12 months after entry. Cohort IV was posttested after nine months--just a few days before the end of the demonstration period.

Cohorts III and IV had randomly assigned control groups, but there were no controls for Cohort II. At three of the sites, there were also regular high school and alternative high school comparison groups for Cohort III. In addition, Site A had a small comparison group made up of dropouts.

It is extremely important to consider the implementation events discussed in Chapter III when weighing the evaluation results. While there is ample evidence that the CIP is transportable and can be effectively replicated in new sites, it is not an easy program to establish. All of the sites operated in a less-than-ideal manner during part of the demonstration period, and one never attained a satisfactory level of implementation.

Strong evidence regarding the importance of implementation events and status is afforded by the intern retention rates that were observed when program operations were proceeding well or poorly at the various sites. As can be inferred from the site case histories, the CIP operated well at Site B during the entire 12-month period between pre- and posttesting of second-cohort interns. Site A also operated reasonably well during most of this period but Sites C and D were experiencing severe leadership problems. The problems of the latter two sites were reflected by a high combined attrition rate of 87%.[1] The combined attrition rate for Sites A and B was substantially lower (77%) and the difference between the two sites was statistically significant.

Implementation at Site A began a rapid decline at about the time third-cohort interns entered the program. On the other hand, OIC/A's intervention at Site D and the subsequent appointment of a new director resulted in rapid improvement at that site. At Site C, things began to improve with the hiring of a new director but recovery was slower because of an inadequate facility, threats of termination from DOL, and continued recruiting difficulties. Site B continued to operate well.

Again intern attrition rates reflect site events. The combined rate for Sites A and C (81%) was statistically significantly higher than that for Sites B and D (65%).

By the time the fourth cohort had entered the program, Site C had attained nearly full implementation. Sites B (despite the loss of its director) and D continued to function quite well while Site A, despite repeated attempts to find an adequate director, continued to founder. During this period its attrition rate was 79%--significantly higher than the combined rates for Sites B, C, and D (58%).

Changes in implementation also had observable effects within sites. At Site C, the attrition rate for fourth-cohort interns (when the program was functioning well) was 48%--significantly lower than the 82% rate for second- and third-cohort interns.

At Site D, where improvement occurred somewhat earlier, the combined attrition rate for third- and fourth-cohort interns (65%) was significantly lower than it had been for second-cohort interns (91%).

There was also a trend toward increased attrition as a function of time at Site A, but it did not attain statistical significance.

It seems clear that the CIP's ability to retain students provides a measure of success in implementation. When the sites were operating smoothly they were able to retain a substantially higher proportion of interns than when they were experiencing implementation difficulties. While this finding is hardly surprising, it does have some interesting implications for other indicators of program success.

---

[1] The attrition rates used here are from pre- to posttest. They are misleadingly high because many individuals who were pretested never enrolled in the program or departed after only a few days. Inconsistent record keeping by the sites regarding enrollments and terminations, however, precluded the use of a more realistic baseline for computing attrition rates.

When one thinks about the characteristics of interns who remain in the CIP even when it is experiencing operational difficulties as opposed to those who drop out, it seems reasonable to infer that the former are more highly motivated and more in tune with the "work ethic" than the latter. The less motivated, less socialized interns are the ones retained by the well-implemented programs. These same individuals, however, are likely to lower total group performance with respect to other criteria of success, including academic achievement, graduation, and job and post-secondary education placements. This situation, of course, creates the paradox wherein the more successful a program is in retaining marginal interns, the less successful it may appear in achieving its other objectives. At the same time, the program's primary goal is to serve those marginal individuals who are beyond the reach of the regular school system. These relationships need to be kept in mind as the remainder of this chapter is read.

Test Score Outcomes

A variety of analytic techniques were employed in assessing gains on each of the variables measured by paper-and-pencil tests. Gain estimates were derived from control and comparison group data using analysis of covariance and standardized gain procedures. Reading and math gains (on the Metropolitan Achievement Test, 1978 edition) were also calculated using a norm-referenced design (Tallmadge, 1981) and interpolated normative data. The interested reader is referred to Tallmadge and Yuen (1981) for greater detail regarding the evaluation methodology and analytic results.

Results of the norm-referenced analyses of reading achievement scores are presented in Table 1. As can be seen, when data were combined across cohorts, the gain estimates were statistically significant at all four sites. When the data were combined across sites, the gain estimates were statistically significant for Cohorts III and IV but not significant for Cohort II. Overall, the estimated gain was 6.7 NCEs, nearly a third of a national-sample standard deviation and educationally significant. The gain had the effect of moving the mean performance level of the 328-member treatment group from the 24th to the 35th percentile of the national norms.

The individual-site analyses show increasingly large gains from earlier to later cohorts at Sites B, C, and D. This pattern matches, and is thought to result from, the increasingly effective instruction provided at those sites. At Sites C and D the increase in instructional effectiveness was apparently more than enough to offset any losses that may have accrued from the increased ability of those sites to retain marginal students. Turnover at Site A was too high to permit significant maturation of the instructional staff or improvement of course materials.

Table 1

Treatment Group Pre-to-Posttest NCE Gains in Reading: Estimates Derived from Norm-Referenced Analyses

Site	Cohort	Pretest NCE Mean	Posttest NCE Mean	NCE Gain	N	*t*	p
A	II	45.2	49.7	4.5	18	1.87	.05
	III	32.6	36.6	4.0	22	1.38	—
	IV	34.6	37.7	3.2	21	.87	—
	Combined	37.0	40.8	3.8	61	2.20	.025
B	II	34.0	37.2	3.2	15	1.23	—
	III	41.4	48.5	7.1	50	2.82	.005
	IV	32.4	40.8	8.4	32	4.68	.001
	Combined	37.3	44.2	6.9	97	4.67	.001
C	II	31.0	29.0	-2.0	9	.61	—
	III	34.0	39.6	5.6	21	1.64	—
	IV	39.6	48.3	8.7	34	4.98	.001
	Combined	36.5	42.7	6.2	64	3.92	.001
D	II	33.5	33.7	.2	6	.06	—
	III	34.8	42.3	7.5	33	2.54	.01
	IV	30.5	40.2	9.7	67	5.47	.001
	Combined	32.0	40.5	8.5	106	5.76	.001
All	II	37.6	39.9	2.3	48	1.61	—
	III	36.9	43.3	6.4	126	4.39	.001
	IV	33.5	41.8	8.3	154	7.79	.001
	Combined	35.4	42.1	6.7	328	8.51	.001

Norm-referenced gain estimates were also generated for the control and comparison groups. They were, surprisingly, also positive and statistically significant, although generally smaller than those of the treatment group. Analyses that compared treatment with control groups and treatment with comparison groups yielded gain estimates that were statistically significant but substantially smaller than the estimates derived from the norm-referenced analyses.

Across analyses, it seems safe to conclude that the CIP experience did have a significant positive impact on reading achievement. Its magnitude, however, remains somewhat of a question. The authors are inclined to favor the larger, norm-referenced estimate under the assumption that there was self-selection in the control group with only those individuals who felt they could significantly improve on their pretest score volunteering to take the posttest. It must be acknowledged, however, that this assumption is speculative.

The results in math were similar to those in reading, but the gain estimates were somewhat smaller. This finding was not surprising, as the sites experienced great difficulty in attracting and retaining qualified math instructors.

The norm-referenced, pre-to-posttest results in math are summarized in Table 2. Combined across sites, the gain estimates were statistically significant for all three of the cohorts studied. Three of the four individual-site, across-cohort estimates were also statistically significant as were 5 of the 12 individual-site, individual-cohort estimates. It was noteworthy that the pattern of math gains closely matched the comings and goings of math teachers at the various sites.

At Site A, both the second and third cohorts showed substantial gains. Despite the generally poor state of implementation at that site, an excellent math teacher was hired just after the second-cohort interns were midtested. At midtest time those interns had gained only 1.3 NCEs, but they added 5.0 more after arrival of the math teacher. She continued to be effective with third-cohort interns (who gained 14.0 NCEs), but left the program before the fourth cohort could benefit from her instruction.

Third-cohort interns at Site B gained 6.2 NCEs between mid- and posttesting, again reflecting the presence of a well qualified math instructor. Unfortunately he remained with the program only six months.

Overall, the norm-referenced results are encouraging. They also suggest that larger gains would have occurred had math teaching positions been vacant less frequently. In any case, the 327 interns who had both pre- and posttests showed an achievement gain that moved them from the national percentile rank of 12.4 to 17.1. (It is noteworthy that the math achievement level of CIP participants was much lower than the reading achievement level--17.4 percentile points at posttest time.)

Table 2

Treatment Group Pre-to-Posttest NCE Gains in Math:
Estimates Derived from the Norm-Referenced Analyses

Site	Cohort	Pretest NCE Mean	Posttest NCE Mean	NCE Gain	N	*t*	p
A	II	30.6	36.8	6.3	18	1.75	.05
	III	16.1	30.1	14.0	22	3.28	.005
	IV	23.6	22.3	- 1.3	21	.61	—
	Combined	23.0	29.4	6.4	61	3.0	.005
B	II	20.8	24.7	3.9	15	1.29	—
	III	27.1	36.0	8.9	50	4.42	.001
	IV	25.7	25.4	- .3	32	.11	—
	Combined	25.7	30.8	5.1	97	3.66	.001
C	II	27.5	24.2	- 3.2	9	.97	—
	III	28.9	29.1	.2	21	.07	—
	IV	32.2	38.5	6.3	34	2.92	.005
	Combined	30.5	33.4	3.0	64	1.85	.05
D	II	20.9	29.7	8.8	6	1.68	—
	III	25.5	30.5	5.0	32	2.45	.025
	IV	24.0	25.8	1.7	67	1.00	—
	Combined	24.3	27.4	3.1	65	.26	—
All	II	25.8	29.8	4.0	48	2.14	.025
	III	25.1	32.4	7.3	125	5.44	.001
	IV	26.1	28.0	1.9	154	1.81	.05
	Combined	25.7	30.0	4.3	327	5.52	.001

The gain estimates generated from comparisons with the control groups were considerably smaller, and none of them attained statistical significance. In at least a few cases, the covariance analysis approach that was employed in these analyses appeared to be inappropriate because of large pretest differences between groups (that resulted from differential attrition). With pretest differences of this nature, covariance analysis systematically underestimates treatment effects (Campbell & Boruch, 1975). When the more appropriate standardized gain analysis was employed, the third-cohort gain estimate was significant at Site A and across all four sites. Again, it must be remembered that the sites often operated without the services of qualified math instructors. The evidence suggests that the gains would have been larger had the sites experienced less difficulty in obtaining and retaining math instructors.

Gain estimates derived from analyses involving the comparison groups presented a very positive picture. With only two exceptions, the estimates were large (ranging from 5.6 to 23.8 NCEs) and statistically significant. Unfortunately, large pretest differences between treatment and comparison groups detract from the credibility of these treatment-effect estimates.

Analyses performed on the Planning, Use of Resources, and Information scales of the Career Development Inventory (Super, 1970) yielded overwhelmingly positive results. When data were combined across sites and cohorts, all three scales showed statistically significant gains at posttest time in all analyses involving the control groups, the regular high school comparison groups, and the alternative high school comparison groups. All of the scales also showed statistically significant gains for Cohort III when the data were combined across sites. The fourth-cohort results were less positive, however, with only the Information scale producing a statistically significant gain estimate.

The difference between third and fourth cohorts may be partially due to the fact that the third cohort received three months more "treatment" between pre- and posttests than the fourth cohort. An even more credible explanation stems from observations that intern-counselor interactions were less frequent during the extension portion of the demonstration period than during the first two years. This reduction, in turn, resulted from the departure of a number of career counselors and the huge paperwork load imposed on those who remained by large fourth-cohort enrollments, the inclusion of additional schools in the recruitment/catchment area, and related problems.

On the Self-Esteem scale of the Self-Esteem Inventory (Coopersmith, 1967), the Cohort III CIP group significantly outperformed the control, regular high school, and alternative high school groups at posttest time. The Cohort IV CIP group, however, did not significantly outperform its control group. The shorter pre-to-posttest interval coupled with the imminent ending of the demonstration are likely causes of the nonsignificant finding. There were no consistent gains on the Openness scale of the Self-Esteem Inventory, or on the Internal-External (locus of control) scale (Rotter, 1966).

In all of the analyses presented above, the only treatment group students tested were those who were currently enrolled in the program or who had graduated from it. No attempt was made to collect test scores from youths who were assigned to the treatment group but who either failed to enroll in the program or terminated prior to the mid- or posttest sessions. For the two follow-up studies that were undertaken (the first in the summer of 1980 and the second in January/February 1981) an attempt was made to collect data from all students assigned to the treatment group (whether they enrolled--and thus received the treatment--or not) and to the control group. This was done to minimize the impact of possible self-selection biases on the integrity of the evaluation design.

While the inclusion in the treatment group of youths who did not enroll or who remained in the program only briefly did help to maintain the integrity of the design, this procedure also minimized the size of treatment effect estimates since they were based on both treated and untreated students. The latter consideration led RMC to subdivide the treatment group into treated (those who enrolled in the CIP and remained a minimum of three months) and untreated (those who did not enroll or left the program in less than three months) subgroups. In weighing evidence from the two follow-ups, it should be kept in mind that comparisons between treatment and control groups will systematically underestimate the size of treatment effects while those between the treated subgroup and either the untreated subgroup or the control group may systematically overestimate treatment effects (because of self-selection bias).

The follow-up data lent themselves to two major comparisons. The first compared groups in terms of high school status. The proportions from each group who had graduated from high school, were currently enrolled, or had earned GEDs were contrasted with the proportion who had dropped out of school prior to graduation and had not earned GEDs. The second major comparison contrasted groups in terms of those members who were either enrolled in school (high school, college, GED, or vocational) or employed, as opposed to those who were neither enrolled nor employed.

Table 3 summarizes the high school status data for the treated, untreated, and control groups by cohort and follow-up. The data have been collapsed across sites. Chi Square analyses showed that significantly larger percentages[2] of treated youths had graduated from high school, were currently enrolled, or had earned GEDs than untreated youths in each of the five comparisons. (Chi Squares ranged from 3.90 for Cohort III, second follow-up, to 15.43 for Cohort II, first follow-up. These values were statistically significant at the .05 and .001 levels respectively.)

---

[2] The actual Chi square computations (appropriately) employed the numbers of youths falling into each category, rather than the percentages. Percentages were used in Tables 3 and 4 and the related discussions to facilitate interpretation of the data. The numbers, of course, can be derived by multiplying the sample sizes by the corresponding percentages.

Table 3

High School Status of Members of the
Treated, Untreated, and Control Groups

Cohort	Follow-Up	Group	% Grad., GED or Enrolled	% Dropped Out	Sample Size
II	First	Treated	67%	33%	128
		Untreated	34%	66%	50
	Second	Treated	63%	37%	133
		Untreated	39%	61%	51
III	First	Treated	60%	40%	241
		Untreated	39%	61%	76
		Control	52%	48%	145
	Second	Treated	49%	51%	275
		Untreated	37%	63%	89
		Control	45%	55%	159
IV	First	Treated	63%	37%	249
		Untreated	49%	51%	93
		Control	44%	56%	221

The treated-subgroup-versus-control-group and treatment-group-versus-control-group comparisons were all in the predicted direction, but were not significant in the two, third-cohort follow-ups. The fourth-cohort data favored both the treated subgroup and the treatment group over the controls at better than the .001 level (Chi Squares = 17.31 and 12.90 respectively). These findings were largely attributable to Site D where 80% of the 95 treated youths had graduated from high school, were currently enrolled, or had earned a GED (compared to 33% of the 95 control youths). This finding is consistent with the exemplary manner in which the CIP was operating at Site D while the fourth cohort was attending.

When comparisons were made between those who were either enrolled in school or employed and those who were neither in school nor employed, the across-site data attested to the statistically significant superiority of the treated over the untreated subgroups for the first follow-ups of Cohorts II, III, and IV (see Table 4). Data from the second follow-ups of Cohorts II and III were in the predicted direction but were not statistically significant.

Table 4

School/Employment Status of Members of the Treated and Untreated Subgroups

Cohort	Follow-Up	Group	% In School or Employed	% Not In School or Unemployed	Sample Size
II	First	Treated	63%	37%	128
		Untreated	42%	58%	50
	Second	Treated	59%	41%	133
		Untreated	53%	47%	51
III	First	Treated	66%	34%	241
		Untreated	51%	49%	76
		Control	64%	36%	148
	Second	Treated	56%	44%	275
		Untreated	44%	56%	89
		Control	58%	42%	161
IV	First	Treated	69%	31%	249
		Untreated	66%	34%	93
		Control	55%	45%	221

Data from the first (and only) follow-up of Cohort IV showed that both the treated-versus-control and treatment-versus-control comparisons were highly significant at Site D and across all sites. Across sites, 69% of the 249 treated youths were either in school or employed as opposed to 55% of the 221 controls (Chi Square = 9.62, $p < .01$).

When interpreting the follow-up data, it should be remembered that the first follow-up of second-cohort interns occurred approximately 22 months after their enrollment in the CIP. Third-cohort interns were first followed up approximately 18 months after their enrollment while the first follow-up interval was approximately 12 months for fourth-cohort interns. The second follow-up (for second- and third-cohort interns) occurred six months after the first.

It appears from the data in both Tables 3 and 4 that program effects dissipate with time (between first and second follow-up). This appearance, however, is felt to be deceiving. For both second and third cohorts, larger numbers of returns were obtained for the second follow-up than for the first. The majority of these additional returns were from "unsuccessful" members of the treated subgroup. While incomplete records prevent a rigorous test of the hypothesis, there is some evidence that these individuals were kept on the sites' books as enrolled despite the fact that they were sporadic or non-attenders. A more accurate picture of program impact might be obtained by placing these individuals in the untreated rather than the treated subgroup.

Summary

In summary, the evidence that the CIP replications were successful includes the following:

- Statistically and educationally significant gains in reading.
- Statistically significant gains in math with growth rates when qualified math teachers were present that would have produced educational significance as well.
- Statistically significant gains on all three scales of the Career Development Inventory. (There is no known criterion of educational significance that can be applied to these scales.)
- Statistically significant gains in self-esteem.
- Statistically significant benefits in terms of high school status.
- Statistically significant benefits in terms of school/employment status.

These results were obtained despite the facts that (a) full implementation was achieved at only two of the sites, and (b) there were periods when even those two sites experienced major problems.

V. FACTORS RELATED TO SUCCESS

Evidence from Chapter III, Site Case Histories, clearly shows that the Career Intern Program, originally developed in Philadelphia, can be successfully transported to new sites. The evidence also shows that such replication is not an easy task. Only two of the sites (B and D) achieved full implementation and were able to maintain it for exended time periods. Site C was slightly less successful--and for a somewhat shorter period of time. Site A approached full implementatin only for a brief period early in its history. All four sites experienced major peoblems on more than one occasion during the demonstration period.

CIP outcomes are intimately related to the nature and extent of program implementation. Many of the relationships, however, are neither simple nor straightforward. While the data do support a direct linkage between quality of implementation and the ability of the sites to retain enrolled interns, other outcomes are less strongly influenced. Substantial gains in mathematics achievement, for example, were observed at sites where there were severe implementation problems and high attrition rates. At least when qualified math instructors were present, those interns whose motivation was sufficient to maintain their involvement under adverse conditions accrued significant benefits. In fact, it was inferred that full implementation--because it tended to keep marginally motivated interns enrolled--actually reduced the extent to which program success was reflected by academic achievement and (possibly) other criteria.

Because full program implementation is clearly related to success in retaining those youths who have the greatest need for non-traditional educational assistance, the primary focus of this chapter is on factors related to successful program implementation. While some reference is made to intern outcomes, the main discussion of how program components interact to produce these outcomes is contained in that portion of Chapter VI that deals with Task C.

Time and Timing

Adequate amounts of time must be allowed for planning and preparation activities if the implementation of a program as complex as the CIP is to proceed smoothly. Unfortunately, neither the allocated amount of time nor the timing of start-up activities were conducive to success in the CIP demonstration. A brief review of the schedule of events illustrates this point. The YEDPA legislation was enacted in August, 1977. In September, OIC/A made its first tentative contacts with local OICs, telling them there was a strong possibility that a CIP demonstration would be funded and suggesting they should begin preparing feasibility studies. No specific or concrete promises could be made, however, as DOL and NIE had not yet reached agreement. In early November, the DOL-NIE Interagency Agreement was signed, setting the formal operation into progress. Meanwhile, OIC/A requested that local OICs submit information about their qualifications to be demonstration sites. After DOL and NIE had reached agreement, DOL allocated the money to operate the demonstration to NIE. NIE, in turn, entered into a contract with OIC/A on 8 December, 1977. Only then could OIC/A negotiate subcontracts with the four local OICs that had submitted the best feasibility studies. The OIC/A-local OIC contracts became effective 15 December, 1977.

The DOL-NIE agreement stipulated that the CIPs were to begin serving students in January, 1978. Thus, the local OICs had six or seven weeks to accomplish a vast array of planning and preparation tasks--staff recruitment and training, intern recruitment, selection and preparation of a facility, acquisition of materials, review and integration of the CIP curriculum with that of the local LEA, and securing LEA and teachers' union permissions to operate. OIC/A had to plan and deliver start-up training and technical assistance in the same time frame. Not surprisingly, this highly compressed schedule created an atmosphere of pressure and anxiety for all the OIC actors. Inevitably, decisions were made in haste and preparations were not as thorough as the complexity and delicacy of the demonstration warranted. This inauspicious beginning had long-lasting effects.

Two findings relate to the amount of time allowed for various dissemination and implementation activities. First, adequate time was not allowed for OIC/A and the sites to conduct careful planning and preparation prior to full-scale operation. As a result, staffing had to be done hurriedly without either adequate searches for appropriately qualified people or rigorous screening of applicants. Training, too, had to be accomplished quickly with the result that trainees were overwhelmed with information and unable to digest it. Once staffing and training were accomplished, only one month remained for getting the facility ready; obtaining supplies, furniture, and curriculum materials; recruiting students; obtaining LEA approval of staff and curricula; reviewing transcripts and determining the academic needs of students; establishing class schedules; and rostering students.

It is not surprising that none of the sites succeeded in accomplishing these tasks on schedule, but the consequences of making the attempt took many months to overcome. Inadequately qualified and trained staff members had to be upgraded or replaced, and building good working relationships with the LEAs was made far more difficult by inadequate and/or misleading communications during the early months of the demonstration.

The second finding was that not enough time was allowed for program operations to stabilize before formal evaluation was imposed on the CIPs. The CIPs were exposed to visitors--from NIE, DOL, RMC, and OIC/A--asking questions and observing activities before the staff members had had a chance to become familiar and comfortable with their tasks, with the CIP design and procedures, and with each other. The visits were very unnerving, anxiety-provoking, and probably unfair to both the sites and the evaluation. This is not to say that the early stages of the demonstration should have been closed to inquiry. On the contrary, there are many issues of importance to be investigated during the early stages of implementation, from initial decision-making about adoption through planning and preparation into operation. However, such investigation could have been designed to be less disruptive to implementation progress by, for instance, including a research/documentation component in the implementation designs.

These points about too little time being allowed for planning, preparation, and pre-evaluation operation raise the question about how much time should have been granted the sites. While a specific recommendation about this issue should be based on more empirical data than are available, our best judgment is that, if the CIPs had been granted a period of about one semester for planning and program preparation and one semester of pilot operation, implementation would have proceeded nearly as smoothly as possible.

Relative to timing, the calendars of other relevant programs or institutions in the replication-site communities were not adequately considered in planning the demonstration. As one example, staff members for the CIPs were hastily recruited in the middle of the regular school year, which restricted the pool of available instructional personnel to those who had recently moved to the area, had not been able to find positions in the public schools, or were otherwise unemployed. Consequently, candidates accepted for CIP positions were not always adequately qualified.

The timing of the CIP start-up was also unfortunate with respect to recruiting. The time of year--shortly after Christmas and during the public schools' semester break--meant that grades for the first semester and schedules for the second were in preparation. Not only were school personnel very busy, but it would be several months before all the information would be digested and they would be prepared to identify potential dropouts.

To summarize, the time and timing of the CIP demonstration were far from ideal. Not enough time was allotted for crucial planning and preparation tasks, nor for pre-evaluation operation (a "shakedown" period). As a consequence, tasks were done incompletely or not at all, decisions were made hastily and prematurely, and a sense of crisis pervaded the CIP sites. Naturally these occurrences were detrimental. Even OIC/A, which has a justified reputation for quick development and installation of new programs, was unable to counteract the impact of too little time for judicious preparation. Not only did a substantial amount of schedule slippage occur, the experience of failure had a long-term negative impact on staff morale and motivation. Similarly, the mismatch between the CIP implementation schedule and the calendars of other institutions in the four communities--primarily the school systems--hindered implementation. In future efforts of a similar nature, allowing sufficient preparation time and coordinating with other agencies' schedules will strongly enhance prospects for success.

Realistic Expectations

The preceding discussion of time and timing encompassed one area in which expectations were unrealistic and negatively impacted on the CIP demonstration. Recruitment was another such area. Enrollment quotas for both treatment and control groups were unrealistically high--at least for the initial cohorts. The quotas were determined from an analysis of the sample sizes required to produce statistically significant results given a treatment effect of some assumed size. Little consideration was given to the feasibility of obtaining groups of the prescribed sizes, even though the prototype site in Philadelphia had experienced major problems in attracting enough qualified students to meet similar quotas (Gibboney Associates, 1977, Vol. 1, p. 27).

The quotas for treatment and control group membership were specified in the NIE-DOL interagency agreement and in NIE's contract with OIC/A. Failure to achieve them thus became a contract violation. It was perhaps for this reason that extreme pressure, including threats of termination, was brought to bear on the sites to meet the quotas. There were many negative consequences.

Perhaps the most significant effect was on the relationships between the sites and other actors in the demonstration effort. OIC/A, NIE, and DOL all became villains in the eyes of site personnel--heavy-handed managers who neither understood problems nor were willing to help. At one point, the CIP sites banded together refusing to give information to OIC/A until a fragile bond of trust was reestablished.

A second and closely related consequence was the feeling of helplessness and failure that the experience instilled in site personnel. It was clear to them that the enrollment expectations for early cohorts were unrealistic, but all efforts on their part to get them changed appeared to fall on deaf ears. Eventually the sites were allowed to enroll cohorts that were smaller than the specified size and were permitted to serve three rather than four cohorts (in the original two-year demonstration period). These concessions, however, were always made grudgingly and without any acknowledgement that the expectations had been unrealistic. The sites were allowed to continue, but it was made clear to them that they had failed.

A third consequence of the unrealistic expectations was the impact they had on program operations. During recruitment "crunches," the entire counseling staff, many of the instructors, and even some of the interns were pressed into service. Normal instructional and counseling activities often ground to a halt. Interns were not receiving the services they needed. Attendance dropped and terminations spurted.

A fourth consequence was the enrollment of inappropriate students. Normal screening criteria were relaxed in order to "get the numbers," and the result was that students with inadequate academic backgrounds and motivation were taken into the program. They were disruptive of normal routines, attended sporadically, and dropped out at a very high rate. Attendance and retention rates were low and made the programs appear less effective than they were.

In fairness, it must be pointed out that the sites--at least initially--did not do an outstanding job of recruiting. In some cases, there was a definite lack of know-how and/or motivation, and corrective action would have been appropriate. Even with competent and well-trained recruiters, however, it seems clear that enrollment expectations for the early cohorts were unrealistic. Unfortunately, persons who were in positions to deal with the problem did not come to this realization in time, and the matter was handled in an unenlightened and unfortunate manner.

Unrealistic expectations were most prominent in the implementation timeline and enrollment quota areas. The sites, however, were also unrealistically expected to obtain school-board and teacher-union agreements without making concessions that later proved necessary. Again the problems was not so much that the original expectations were unrealistic. The problem lay in the fact that they were not subsequently recognized as unrealistic and modified. The sites were blamed and threatened for inadequate performance by actors who subsequently had to make the same concessions that would have enabled the sites to obtain the desired agreements in the first place.

A final area in which expectations appeared unrealistic was the salary scale. CIP instructors and counselors were paid substantially less than their counterparts in the public high schools. At the same time, they received less vacation and fewer fringe benefits. The expectation was that dedication to the cause of disadvantaged youth would compensate for the salary and fringe benefit differentials. In fact, many dedicated individuals did go to work at the CIP sites. Frequently, however, they were tempted away by higher salaries, better fringe benefits, or opportunities for professional advancement. The situation, of course, was exacerbated by the insecurity of CIP employment, implementation problems, and inadequate leadership at some sites.

One instructor discussed the various concerns of individual staff members during an RMC site visit.

> The pay scale, that's one of the main things. We need the same certification but we get paid a CBO scale rather than that of the high school.... We also need a planning period, some

> of us get one and others don't. Another problems is that disipline is too lax. But the biggest thing is the schedule. We work with more difficult kids for longer hours and have less vacation time and no summer vacation. We need a time to plan, to regenerate ourselves. You can't do it, you just get burned out. It's that simple.

In retrospect, it seems clear that the CIP demonstration would have benefitted greatly from more realistic expectations in the areas of implementation timelines, enrollment quotas, LEA and teacher-union agreements, and staff compensation. Furthermore, as problems developed in each of these areas, a more flexible outlook, greater trust, and a less heavy-handed management style would have led to improved morale, more productive working relationships, and more enlightened approaches to problem solution.

Leadership

Strong leadership is definitely one of the key components for a successful CIP implementation. The primary leader, of course, is the CIP director. It is important, therefore, to consider the skills, abilities, and personal characteristics that appear to be associated with success in that job.

Perhaps the best way to define the characteristics required of a successful director is to begin by enumerating the functions that he or she must fulfill. Within the CIP building itself, the director must supervise both the instructional and counseling components of the program. With the assistance of both local and national OICs, he/she must recruit, hire, train, and review the performance of the professional staff. To do so, he/she must thoroughly understand the performance requirements of each job. These functions also entail the ability to establish and maintain comprehensive personnel information files.

The unique nature of the CIP makes these functions both more critical to the success of the operation and more demanding on the director than their counterparts in regular high schools. Unlike the average high school principal, the director is highly accountable for what goes on in the classroom and in student counseling sessions. He/she must make sure that instructors and counselors not only perform up to the established standards of their professions, but also that they are:

- sensitive to the special needs of the target group;
- able to gain the trust and respect of interns;
- able to convince interns that they can improve their life chances; and
- able to motivate interns to work toward that end.

He/she must work with staff members who show deficiencies in any of these areas and replace those who are unwilling or unable to adopt appropriate behavior patterns.

Because both instructors and counselors routinely deal with very difficult populations, they operate under considerable stress. The director must be readily accessible to them and must understand the difficulties inherent in their jobs. He/she must take time to counsel and reassure them. When called upon to mediate disputes within the staff or between staff members and interns, he/she must be scrupulously open and fair. He/she must be able to make and back up tough decisions firmly but without being, or giving the impression of being, arbitrary.

The director must also understand, care about, and interact with the interns. Just as it was the impersonal and uncaring nature of the regular school experience that drove many of the CIP participants to seek an alternative, it is the personally aware and caring attitude at all levels of the CIP that is one of the program's most important keys to success.

Because the CIPs are so small, the director must also get involved in many mundane housekeeping and other duties. He/she has to worry about the lunch program, certification of the facility, break-ins and thefts, and equipment and building maintenance. On a less routine level, he/she also bears responsibility for all budgetary and fiscal matters (usually with assistance from the local OIC).

CIP directors also have many responsibilities that entail interactions with outside agencies. Initially they must "sell" the CIP to administrators in the local school district and to the local school board. They must convince these individuals of the value of the program and must negotiate with them regarding cooperative working relationships. Failure to complete these negotiations successfully will, at the least, seriously impair the program's ability to recruit adequate numbers of students--and there may very well be even more serious consequences.

In all probability, it will also be necessary to negotiate with teacher organizations/unions. The result of these negotiations must leave the CIP free to hire energetic, sensitive instructors and counselors with whom the interns will be able to relate and who will provide appropriate role models. If the CIP is compelled to hire unemployed union teachers from the top of the seniority list, the chances of the program succeeding are substantially reduced.

Experience suggests that negotiations with both the school district and the teacher organizations are likely to be difficult. Both groups may (at least partially) perceive the CIP as an intruder attempting to take over part of their turf. The director must, therefore, be a convincing presenter of the facts and a skillful salesperson. He or she must also be persistent in working out the details of the cooperative relationships and in obtaining binding written agreements so that there are no surprises on either side as program implementation unfolds.

The career component of the CIP also requires that the program have good working relationships with local business and industry. While another member of the CIP staff bears primary responsibility for this function, the director must also play an active role, particularly in establishing, but also in maintaining these relationships. The stature associated with the director's position will open doors not accessible to others--but he or she must have the know-how to capitalize on the initial openings or they may be permanently lost.

It follows from what has been said thus far that the director must have all of the administrative expertise of a regular school principal plus a quite extensive repertoire of additional skills. He or she must also have personal characteristics that inspire the respect of staff, students, and various community groups including especially the local school district and industry. All of these characteristics may be essential to the viability of any particular CIP. At least it is clear that a CIP has far less chance of survival with a marginal director than does a regular high school. The infrastructure provided by long-established tradition serves to guarantee the viability of regular schools. Such institutions (the word itself is significant) serve more docile and accepting target groups and can afford to be substantially more impersonal and less responsive than a CIP, where identifying and meeting student needs are paramount.

The two most successful CIP leaders differed quite dramatically in "style." One was autocratic and dictatorial, the other soft spoken and democratic. Because of this difference, one must conclude that a broad range of styles is acceptable.

Both directors were extremely competent individuals (both had Ph.Ds) and had extensive administrative experience. Both were dedicated to the cause of disadvantaged youth and both sincerely cared about the interns in their programs as individuals. Another similarity is that both directors were readily accessible to both staff and interns. Although one was less democratic than the other, both maintained open communication channels and were scrupulously fair in their dealings with others. All of these characteristics appear to be prerequisites of success for CIP directors.

Know-How

Know-how is just as important for other members of the CIP staff as it is for the director. Unfortunately, many duties were unfamiliar to the CIP staff members who had to perform them. Rostering students is one example. Skills of this nature can be learned, of course, but the CIP implementation timeline did not allow for sufficient training. Skills that staff members brought with them to the job were at a premium.

Some of the major implementation problems that the sites encountered therefore stemmed from a lack of know-how. Tasks such as recruiting students are not in the normal repertoire of high school teachers or counselors, and the staffs at several of the sites were totally devoid of expertise in this area. While training was provided on recruiting strategies as well as procedures for rostering students it was, for one reason or another, inadequate. Several trainees did not remember that particular topics had been covered in their training--even though they had been.

Many of the CIP instructors and counselors were young and inexperienced. Some had never worked in a high school setting before their CIP experience. These individuals could not function effectively without a substantial amount of training. With a timeline that precluded much training, the only solution would have been to hire better qualified individuals. And, of course, both the timing of the initial hiring and the salary structure made this solution virtually unattainable.

There is little point in dwelling on this issue. It was clear from on-site observations, however, that many staff members lacked adequate skill and/or knowledge to perform their jobs effectively. Had better qualified persons been hired or had more extensive training been provided, the CIP demonstration would have experienced many fewer difficulties.

Centralized Monitoring and Technical Assistance

The CIP replications were set up by and operated under the supervision of local OIC chapters. Central administration, monitoring, and technical assistance, however, were provided by OIC/A. It seems doubtful that the demonstration would have achieved the level of success that it did without OIC/A involvement.

One area in which OIC/A involvement was critical was that of fidelity to the model. Not only was the model promulgated by means of documentation and training provided by that group, their constant overseeing of operations prevented the kind of inadvertent "straying" that invariably occurs in the absence of such monitoring. Their availability to provide counsel and guidance as required or requested by site personnel also proved to be an essential ingredient of success.

OIC/A had to intervene in negotiations with the LEAs and teacher organizations. Although this intervention at times was more direct and heavy handed than might have been necessary or desirable, it seems clear that the sites would have been less successful in these negotiations had they been left entirely on their own.

The most dramatic example of the important role played by OIC/A occurred at Site D. Inadequate leadership was having a devastating effect on CIP operations and the local OIC appeared unwilling to take corrective action. It was necessary for OIC/A to intervene directly, to terminate the employment of both the director and the instructional supervisor, and to assume full responsibility for operating the program until suitable persons could be found for these positions some three months later. Had these actions not been taken, Site D (which ultimately became one of the two most successful sites) would surely have failed totally and been shut down.

Coordination with LEAs

The CIPs entered the local scene rather abruptly. Timelines dictated that the new CIPs begin serving students some six or seven weeks after they received initial funding. Although no site succeeded in meeting this contractual deadline, pressures to do so were at least partially responsible for inadequate coordination with LEAs.

After general approval for the program to operate and course accreditation, the CIP's main dependence on the LEAs was for student referrals. From their viewpoint, cooperation should not have been a problem since they only wanted access to students who were likely to drop out anyway. The LEAs, however, felt that they had "turf" to protect. They did not like to admit that they had failed to meet the needs of some students (the fault was clearly the students'). They did not understand that they would actually benefit from the CIP's presence (smaller class sizes without any loss of funds, removal of disruptive elements, etc.) but, even more important, they resented the fact that the program had appeared in their midst without so much as a "by your leave" (see Site D case history, p. 40). The reaction of one teachers' union was even stronger since members perceived themselves as the sole purveyors of instructional services and feared that the CIP's intrusion would mean a loss of jobs (see Site C case history, p. 30).

In fact, of course, the CIP did not threaten any jobs and performed a useful function for the LEA. Presumably, this information could have been conveyed to the appropriate parties in a way that would not have aroused strong defensive reactions. Unfortunately, none of the CIPs succeeded in this mission--partly because timelines did not allow for the careful laying of groundwork, partly because the importance of the task was not fully appreciated, and partly because the OIC and CIP leaders lacked experience (know-how) in dealing with the groups in question.

In this instance, experience at the prototype site could not be drawn upon for guidance as the original CIP evolved rather slowly and apparently experienced no difficulties with either the LEA or the teachers' union (Gibboney Associates, 1977).

Effective Staff Selection

The need of the CIPs for technically competent staff at all levels has already been discussed. The staff must also be dedicated to helping disadvantaged youth, sensitive to their problems, and able to relate to them on a personal basis. These qualifications are at least as important as professional expertise.

It was more often the case that staff deficiencies appeared on the professional qualifications side of the ledger than on the dedication side. Late in the developmental history of Site A, however, the director decided to upgrade the professional level of the staff without giving much concern to sensitivity and dedication. The importance of the latter characteristics was revealed by a marked increase in intern absenteeism and turnover. Both personal and professional qualifications are thus important if the CIP is to be implemented as its developers intended.

There were sizeable differences among sites in the area of staff turnover--particularly involuntary turnover. All of the sites lost good people who left in order to advance their careers, but Site A had 24 involuntary terminations (8 of whom held management positions) compared to a total of 3 at Site B (none of whom held management positions). To a large extent this difference can be attributed to hiring practices at the two sites.

The importance of staff turnover should not be underestimated. Both voluntary and involuntary terminations have important implications for staff morale and program climate. While the removal of inadequate directors at Sites C and D (and the instructional supervisor at Site D) had positive effects, most other terminations had negative impacts. Inadequate staff members must, of course, be removed. Retaining them is likely to have even stronger negative effects. The only good solution is to make use of very thorough and careful hiring practices so as to minimize the number of inadequate personnel who get employed.

Summary

The time available for a demonstration and the timing of key program development activities with respect to issues external to the program (e.g. school schedules) are extremely important to the success of the demonstration. If they are unrealistic they lead to hasty and ill-conceived actions which have far-reaching consequences. They also engender feelings of frustration and failure in the staff--which, in turn, lead to dissatisfaction, alienation, and resignations. Other unrealistic expectations have similar effects.

Leadership is almost certainly the single program component most essential to the success of the CIP. Without a strong and competent director to hold it together, the program simply begins to disintegrate. Competent and caring staff are also important but, without good leadership, they are insufficient to keep the program functioning smoothly.

The CIP depends heavely on good working relationships with the "host" school district(s). Its design affords these school district(s) sufficient incentives to obtain their cooperation. The CIP staff, however, plays an important role in establishing and maintaining good working relationships. Once more, the importance of strong leadership and competent staff emerge as key factors. And, of course, the quality of the director and the staff will reflect the adequacy of the recruitment, screening, and hiring practices that led to their employment.

VI. ANSWERS TO THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The Introduction to the report lists a number of research questions, organized by task, that were posed in the original Request for Proposal for this study. Several additional questions became the subject of modifications to the contract between NIE and RMC. These questions are also addressed here.

Task A. Program Implementation

The three original Task A questions were: (a) "What happens to the Career Intern Program in the process of implementation in additional sites?", (b) "What factors account for the changes or adaptations, if any?", and (c) what factors account "for the fidelity, if any, to the original program goals and problems?" (RFP NIE-R-78-0004, p. 9). In addressing the first of these questions, it is appropriate to refer back to the site case histories presented in Chapter III.

The success that was observed primarily at Sites B and D provides ample evidence that the CIP can be replicated at new sites--even under conditions that are less than optimal. Strong leadership, particularly in the role of the director, appears to be a necessary precondition, however.

In addition to the success of Sites B and D, Site A almost succeeded in achieving full implementation before its original director departed. Site C came even closer under the leadership of its second permanent director. At times when leadership was lacking, however, all four sites foundered.

In addition to leadership problems, Site A had the unfortunate experience of being integrated into the LEA rather than remaining outside the system. Although this appeared to be a positive occurrence at the time, it had the result of increasing recruiting difficulties (because, when feeder schools gave up students to the CIP, they also gave up the funds associated with these students--a situation that did not prevail at the other sites). A second negative influence of being incorporated into the LEA was an increase in student turnover. Because of this arrangement, it was easier for students to transfer between schools at Site A, than it was at the other sites. One manifestation of this situation was that many interns left the CIP just before completion, so they could graduate with their friends in the regular schools.

There were several other events that occurred during the replication effort that were unexpected. One was the difficulty encountered with the local teacher unions. Another was the difficulty that sites had in meeting enrollment quotas. Neither of these problems had been encountered during the developmental stages of the prototype CIP in Philadelphia. On the other hand, substantial recruiting difficulties had been encountered during the demonstration period when (and perhaps because) control group quotas also had to be filled. These problems were either forgotten or ignored during the replication, and the sites were led to believe that they had failed.

With respect to changes or adaptations, there were fewer than might have been expected. While there were many "deviations from the model" when the sites were experiencing implementation difficulties, for the most part they were unintentional and temporary. There seems little point in discussing such deviations here.

There were, of course, a few intentional deviations. Perhaps the most noteworthy change occurred at Site A where a position of program manager was created. A similar, but unofficial position evolved at Site C. The program manager functioned as the instructional supervisor but, at both sites, had additional program management responsibilities including supervision of the counseling supervisor. This arrangement served to place an additional layer of management between the directors and their staffs and created some significant morale problems. The directors were perceived as remote, unapproachable, and uninvolved in the day-to-day operations of the sites (which, to at least some extent, they were). In a small, dedicated group, this degree of separation between management and workers is probably counterproductive. RMC judged this modification to the program design to be maladaptive.

Another maladaptive modification occurred at Site C when the CCS was moved from the first period of the day to a later time slot. This change was instituted because attendance was poor early in the morning and participation in the CCS was thought to be important. The change, unfortunately, worked against the goal of having interns internalize world-of-work values. Instead, it created a situation in which they became aware that they could manipulate the program to fit their priorities.

A change that had both positive and negative consequences was the streamlining of the disposition conferences. According to the model, these conferences were to occur often enough so that each intern would be discussed at least every two weeks, were to involve all members of the counseling and instructional staffs, and were to encompass discussions of every intern in the program. Following this design, not surprisingly, was very time consuming, but it built staff cohesiveness, helped all staff members understand the personal and academic problems of all interns, and provided opportunities for joint development of innovative and effective approaches for dealing with such problems.

Streamlining of the "dispos" at one site involved limiting the discussion to those interns who had the most severe problems. Because more time was sorely needed for other activities, this approach appeared to make good sense. A more severe form of streamlining was adopted at another site where only those members of the instructional and counseling staffs who were directly involved with particular interns were convened for their dispo conferences. Although this approach did save substantial amounts of time, it was judged to be a maladaptive change because it drastically reduced the cohesiveness-building, intern-understanding, and practice-sharing functions of the conferences.

A noteworthy positive modification to the CIP model was "CIP-is-HIP" days. This "communal rite of solidarity" was originated at Site A by the original director. Because of its obvious success, the three other sites also adopted it. CIP-is-HIP days are complex affairs that differ somewhat from site to site. They may involve the staff preparing a meal for the interns or the interns preparing one for the staff. One feature almost always present is the granting of awards. Award categories may include best attendance, most talkative, best personality, teacher's pet, always on time, most enthusiastic, most likely to succeed, best leader, most frequent participant, always late, sleeping in class, etc. Ideally, each intern receives some form of recognition.

CIP-is-HIP days serve the important function of bringing the program together. Staff and interns are given an opportunity to get to know each other personally, and the ritual serves to establish a bond linking everyone together as members of a special community.

Another adaptive change involved attendance recording. Most alternative programs serving dropouts and potential dropouts have serious attendance problems. One of the most effective means of dealing with this problem is to impose strong sanctions on unexcused absences. At the CIP, however, the problem was compounded by interns who would check in each morning but then "zip out the back door." Several of the sites developed methods of checking attendance periodically throughout each day. The instructional supervisor at Site C, however, developed a sophisticated system whereby each intern's attendance was checked at each class he or she was scheduled to attend. This system, coupled with rules regarding attendance requirements for earning course credits, was quite effective in raising attendance levels. Some such systems should be formally incorporated into the CIP model.

A problem area for all of the sites was the summer program. While the CIP model calls for "business as usual" during the summer months, by the end of the demonstration period all of the sites had reached the conclusion that this approach was counterproductive. Instructors and counselors alike experienced symptoms of "burnout" and felt the need for vacation periods. Most interns needed some sort of summer job and could not attend school full time.

While the need for a change was felt almost universally, the majority of CIP staff members felt that it would also be a mistake simply to shut down for the summer. They felt that it was important at least to maintain contact with the interns. Although it is not clear what the optimum solution to this problem might be, there was a widespread feeling that some sort of work-study program would be effective. Many thought that interns would be willing to attend the program in the morning if they could work afternoons. Several of the sites were working toward this form of summer program when the demonstration period ended. While it cannot be regarded as a demonstrated improvement, it seems likely that some such modification to the CIP model would reduce observed problems with the summer program.

All in all, the CIP replications were quite faithful to the original model. Much credit for this fidelity must be given to OIC/A. Their frequent visits to all of the sites to monitor and provide technical assistance did much to assure consistent adoption of the model. The existence of an independent evaluation was also partially responsible. Knowledge that RMC would be looking at any deviations from the model acted as an inhibitor of innovation, at least in the early months of the demonstration period. It was some time before RMC could convince either the sites or OIC/A that deviations from the model would not automatically be regarded as bad and that some adaptations would almost certainly be required to optimize the "fit" between the program and the new contexts.

Several other factors also contributed to the fidelity of the replications to the CIP model. First, the model had been developed over a period of several years and had been articulated to a fairly high degree. The components were generally well specified, feasible to implement, known to be effective, and readily accessible to new staff members. There were not many attractive alternatives available, and there was not much time in which to be creative. As time passed, significant changes were made, primarily in the area of curriculum content, but even changes of this type (which are not really considered to be deviations from the model) were virtually impossible during the pressure-filled start-up months.

A second additional factor contributing to the fidelity of replication was the OIC ethos. Because many of the CIP staff members were previously employed by OIC, they had already been indoctrinated into the philosophy of serving the "whole person," caring, and related matters.

Finally, the fact that the CIPs were run by a CBO where doing a professional job is not equated with inventing a new approach (as it so often is in educational circles) also contributed to faithful replication.

Subsidiary research questions under Task A concerned the effectiveness of the OIC system as a vehicle for disseminating the CIP.

RMC's conclusion was that the replication effort was quite effective, given the many negative influences that were operating. Certainly OIC/A and the local OICs made mistakes, some of them serious, but they did succeed overall in what has to be regarded as an extremely difficult task. Much was learned from the effort and all concerned parties would improve on their performance if a similar opportunity were presented in the future. Still, a good job was done and it is doubtful that any other organizations could have done better.

Comparing the effectiveness of the OIC system to the "usual developer/public school linkages" as called for by NIE is not really feasible as the CIP was never disseminated through such linkages. While dissemination of the somewhat similar Experience-Based Career Education program through these linkages is underway and is being studied for NIE, the results of that research are not yet available.

One point that is relevant here concerns relationships between the CIP and the feeder schools. Collaborative working arrangements are essential to the success of the CIP. To achieve them, however, the CIP must have some incentives to offer. When the CIP is separate, it can offer the strong incentive of taking problem students out of the feeder schools without reducing the state monies they receive based on average daily attendance. If the CIP is an integral part of the LEA (as it was at Site A), it and its potential feeder schools will compete for students and the funds that they bring with them. Collaborative working agreements may be very difficult to arrange. For these reasons, RMC believes that the CIP would be very difficult to disseminate successfully through the "usual developer/public school linkages."

Task B. Intern Outcomes

The single Task B research question was, "Does the Career Intern Program continue to be effective in helping youth when it is implemented in sites other than Philadelphia?" (RFP NIE-R-78-0004, p. 13). The evidence relevant to this question appears to be at least as positive as that assembled during the course of the prototype evaluation, although some differences in methodology and instrumentation tend to confound such comparisons.

Both the Gibboney and the RMC analyses showed statistically significant gains in reading compared to the corresponding control groups. The Gibboney analysis, however, was only significant when test scores were corrected for guessing--a procedure RMC believes spuriously inflated the gain estimates (See Tallmade & Yuen, 1981, Appendix D).

In math, the Gibboney analysis showed CIP participants significantly outperforming the controls while the RMC analyses found no significant differences. The replication sites, however, experienced great difficulty in obtaining and retaining qualified math instructors. Data from individual sites suggest that, when qualified math instructors were present, gains were both statistically and educationally significant.

Both the Gibboney and RMC analyses showed statistically significant gains on the Planning, Use of Resources, and Information scales of the Career Development Inventory. The Gibboney analysis showed no gains in self-esteem while RMC found significant self-esteem benefits accruing to third-cohort interns compared to the control group, the regular high school comparison group, and the alternative high school comparison group. Similar gains were not, however, found for fourth-cohort interns.

Neither analysis showed any meaningful treatment effects on the Openness scale of the Self-Esteem Inventory or on the Rotter Internal-External scale.

The two analyses produced similar results in the area of high school and employment status as well although slightly different comparisons were made. The Gibboney analysis found that more CIP participants than controls had graduated from high school. The RMC analysis compared those who had either graduated, earned a GED, or were currently enrolled against those who had dropped out of school without graduating or earning a GED. It found a significant difference favoring CIP participants over the control group for the fourth-cohort, but not for the third.

RMC also found that the fourth-cohort CIP participants were significantly more likely to be either in school or employed than the corresponding control group members. The Gibboney analysis found that CIP graduates were more likely to be in school or employed, but did not present data on participants.

Across all criterion variables, the results from the two evaluations are remarkably similar.

Task C. Relationships between Program Components and Intern Outcomes

The single Task C question was, "What happens to young people in the CIP program that could account for its effectiveness?" (RFP NIE-R-78-0004, p.16). As suggested in previous chapters of this report, there is no simple answer to this question. The relationships among program components and between components and outcomes are extremely complex and difficult to tie down in any kind of simple, straightforward manner. To illustrate, inadequate leadership is likely to lower staff morale which, in turn, will produce a negative program climate. Data show that when the program climate is poor, attendance falls off and many interns drop out of the program altogether. At the same time, the more highly motivated interns will continue to attend regularly and may show substantial growth in basic skill areas. Precisely this situation was observed at Site A.

The opposite kind of situation can also occur. Leadership may be good, staff morale high, the program climate positive, and attendance excellent; but growth in reading or math may be depressed because of the program's inability to fill a key instructional position. This situation was observed at several sites when qualified math instructors departed.

The issue is further complicated by the types of interns who are enrolled. The data show, for example, that dropouts are harder to retain in the program than potential dropouts. Thus a well implemented program with a student body having a high percentage of dropouts could have a lower retention rate than a poorly implemented program serving primarily potential dropouts.

All of these various factors work together to complicate causal relationships to the point where they become nearly impossible to untangle. The conclusions that we have presented about what makes the program "work" are thus not ones that can be defended with logically tight arguments. Rather, they are inferences we have drawn after considering large amounts of observational, interview, and case-study data. While we believe that they are correct and can be defended in a reasonably convincing manner, in another sense they are no more than well informed speculations.

The reader who wishes to examine the evidence in depth is referred to Fetterman's (1981) detailed ethnographic analysis. What is presented here is drawn, in large part, from that source. Unfortunately, space does not permit us to reproduce either his data or his reasoning here, except in the most superficial manner.

According to Fetterman, the CIP comprises three subsystems: the core component subsystem, the support subsystem, and the ideological subsystem. The program's core components are instruction, counseling, Hands-On, Intern Formalized Assessment, and program climate. These components were specifically designed to facilitate the transmission of knowledge, skills, behavior patterns, and cultural values to the interns. All of them were described in Chapter II of this report and, with the possible exception of climate, their relationships to intern outcomes are quite direct.

Climate operates as a kind of catalyst. A product of all participants' values, beliefs, behaviors, and communication patterns, it both provides the kind of support needed by interns whose prior school experiences were abhorrent and motivates them toward achievement of the program's goals. The staff play the most critical roles in producing a supportive and motivating climate through individualized and caring attention, personalized counseling, language and dress codes, and concerned involvement in interns' personal as well as academic problems.

Interns' enthusiasm about instruction, positive attitudes toward the CIP, and diligence in adopting the program's norms of attendance, dress, and behavior are indications that the appropriate climate has been created. Other indications include interns actively involving themselves in learning activities and inforcing rules among themselves.

A positive climate is known to motivate interns to participate in the program. They attend more regularly and are less likely to drop out. When the climate is negative, attendance becomes sporadic, behavior becomes less goal-oriented, and terminations increase--sometimes dramatically. Trends in retention rates matched closely the climate differences between sites and between time periods within sites that are described in Chapter III of this report.

The CIPs' support subsystem is the infrastructure of the program, without which its core components would be unable to operate. It encompasses program rules and regulations, personnel roles and qualifications, curriculum, facilities, funds, materials, and supplies. It also includes relationships with the LEA, the teachers' union, the community, the local OIC, and OIC/A. Most of these components have been discussed elsewhere in this report. The importance of those not discussed (e.g. an adequate facility) should be apparent.

The ideological subsystem of the CIP is largely a product of the parent organization's (OIC/A's) ideology. The basic elements include caring about interns, providing a supportive context for them, providing a realistic perspective for them regarding the world of work, "dealing with the whole intern," maintaining high personal and academic expectations of interns, and treating them as young adults and individuals. All of these elements reflect the OIC/A philosophy which consists of a fusion between a humanistic "serving the whole person" concept and a work-ethic ideology. Exposure to the OIC ethos leads interns to internalize middle-class values and to strive to attain their "fair share" of material rewards.

A major manifestation of the OIC/CIP ethos is caring. Most of the interns' previous experiences were in very large high schools where students were identified by number. Not only was individual attention a rarity but few staff--instructors and counselors alike--knew any students by name. As one intern commented:

> In public schools, really the teachers are not worried about the students--all they're worried about is whether they can pay the light bill or when they can get their car note paid up...and they don't give as much attention as the teachers do here; not attention as far as babying you--I mean real help. Communication with the teachers--they seem to be very helpful. If you have any questions they'll go all-out to help you with those questions; but they won't give them to you; they let you find them out yourself.

Dissatisfaction with the public schools was not unjustified. When one of the authors asked an intern for directions to his former school, he ended his instructions with, "It's the building that looks like a jail." And it did--inside as well as out!

At the CIP, things were very different. As one of the directors commented:

> Here in the CIP not only do we recognize them on a first-name basis, but we talk to them. As a result, we don't have this problem of anonymity which they have been subjected to in the school system. The second part is that they have to wait endlessly to see their counselor in the school system. Sometimes they don't even know who their counselors are and have never even talked to them. Here they can see their counselors on a scheduled or an unscheduled basis. That also reinforces the caring aspect I am talking about.
>
> The third part is the idea of home visits. It's more than just you and I in school for six hours. It's also the extension to the home situation. They appreciate a lot that we are able to visit them in their homes. Their parents understand what we are trying to do because we tell them. Moreover, we are able to educate the parents on how to evaluate the report card. We have been able to let them understand what are the requirements for graduation so that the parents can take a look at the report card and say, "OK, I think you have completed all the electives, now you have to take these courses--otherwise you are not going to graduate."

Caring about interns is not the same as being excessively lenient with them. Maintaining appropriate instructor-intern and counselor-intern relationships serves an important function in the creation of an atmosphere of respect and purposefulness for all parties concerned. The high expectations that staff members hold for interns represent a form of caring and should not, according to one instructor, be undermined by "unearned" leniency. One of the instructional supervisors provided the following observations:

> Well, instructors are strict--I know two in particular--but when I check on the attendance at the end of the month, the strictest one has 79% attendance. In fact, some of his classes got to be 89%, you know. So, you know, if the instructor was too strict and they did not attend his class, then I would check to see what is he doing that's wrong to cause them to stay out of class.

> The most lax teacher, the nicest teacher, is the one who had the least amount of people who attended his class.

> You know...I read [in the first evaluation report] about their dress code and a lot of things...and school is strict, but I think strictness is viewed as caring. If you let people do anything they want to do, they really think you don't care.

Although caring was a pervasive element of the OIC ethos, it was not always universally present at the CIP sites. Instructors, in particular, were sometimes hired for their academic qualifications without adequate consideration having been given to their attitudes. Even in cases where these individuals were excellent teachers, attendance in their classes was poor. One CIP director who did not realize the importance of non-academic qualifications made the unfortunate decision to upgrade the professional level of his instructional and counseling staff. The replacements were perceived by the remaining "old" staff members as the wrong type of people for the job. As one individual stated:

> The staff may be better qualified now from an academic point of view, but they just don't care about the interns. It's just a job for most of them. You need people in the program that are dedicated, that really care.... It's good to improve the quality of the staff, but you need both if it's going to work.

Staff members who care about the interns are very important to the success of the CIP. Caring, however, is not the only important staff characteristic. Professional competence is also critical. It was pointed out earlier that interns made achievement gains in math only when qualified math teachers were present. A linkage was also reported between gains in both self esteem and career awareness. When counselors were busy with other tasks, intern-counselor interactions became less frequent and gains in these areas, which were observed at other times, ceased to appear.

Professional competence was also critical in the case of career developers. Lack of it deprived interns of appropriate Hands-On experiences and other opportunities to develop career awareness. All of these activities are critical to the CIP's success. In the words of one former intern who graduated and is currently enrolled in an engineering program at a four-year college:

> I'm looking forward to being an engineer. [During the time I was at the CIP], they had plenty of career fairs and you got to talk to a lot of people about your career. I went to an engineering firm for a week for my Hands-On. I

> learned how to read blueprints. When I first got there, I didn't know what they was. They actually taught it. The whole CIP has helped me and I'll never forget it. I come back to talk to the interns to let them know that they can make it too.

The adequacy of the staff and its performance is one of the primary responsibilities of the CIP director. Although the hiring and firing of staff members was not always under the total control of the director during the demonstration period, he/she had major inputs to decisions of this type. The director was also responsible for monitoring performance, mediating disputes, providing or procuring in-service training, and instituting disciplinary actions as required. The demonstration afforded RMC the opportunity to observe deficient performance in each of these areas, and the results were always quite dramatic reductions in the quality of program implementation.

Staff members and interns alike repeatedly pointed out the importance of the "presence of authority" to the programs. Many of the checks and balances enforced by the former director at Site B, for example, were temporarily abandoned upon his departure. One staff member complained bitterly of her treatment by a colleague who had taken on the responsibility of supervising her work. The former director had used his authority to suppress this "power play" but it emerged shortly after he left.

In another example, an ineffectual director was replaced by one with strong administrative skills. Dramatic improvements were observed at that site. Staff members reported an improvement in the structure of the program. "Finally, we have one!" commented one instructor. The same person explained how individuals "have finally been assigned clear roles." Another staff member agreed with this perception and linked these improvements to the director of the CIP.

While the causal chain from the CIP director's leadership ability to the interns' cognitive achievement gains may seem long and involved, it is a strong linkage nonetheless. A good case, in fact, could be made for the CIP director being the most essential ingredient for success both in implementing the program and in controlling the environment which produces learning in program participants.

The changes that occur in CIP interns actually begin before they enter the program. At some point, they decide that they want to change their lives. Perhaps they decide that they want their high school diploma, but, even if they do not, they begin to look for a way to change. Such individuals are likely to be attracted to the CIP. It is unlike the schools they have experienced. They view its small size positively, and they may have heard good things about it.

At the time interns sign up for the CIP, their level of commitment may be slight--so slight, in fact, that many of them change their minds before the program is even able to enroll them.

Once enrolled, they are likely to find the individual attention and caring enviroment quite pleasant. Almost immediately, however, they learn that to remain in the program they must obey the rules and live up to certain expectations. They must dress appropriately, complete their homework assignments, research two career fields, and attend regularly. They receive considerable pressure from their own peers, from older interns, and from the CIP staff to conform in these ways--and if they do not, they are out.

At this point it is clear that a higher level of commitment is required both to the goal of changing their lives and to the CIP itself. Substantial numbers of interns are unwilling to make such commitments and leave the program. As time passes, those who remain begin to see the older interns and members of the staff as role models. As their feelings about the program become more positive, they begin to want to "belong." It is at this juncture that they begin to internalize the values that the CIP represents.

Those who reach this level of commitment are likely to remain in the program, earn their high school diplomas, and move on to futher education or employment. Some interns, however, attain a still higher level of commitment. They identify strongly with the group and seek positions on the student council, engage in extracurricular activities, and/or participate in other solidarity-building rituals. They become role models for the newer interns, take an interest in their welfare, and actually become part of the program "treatment." Interns who reach this level of commitment almost always succeed both in the program and after graduation. Most of them go on to college.

The process of "buying in" to the program may occur quite rapidly or may evolve quite slowly. At Site D, one of the real success stories was a marginal participant for nearly two years before a sudden and rather dramatic transformation took place. "He came in smelling like a monster. Thug number one," said an instructor. He was "a hood," according to his friends. Another staff member commented, "His hair was long and wild. He wore that big ol' pimpin' hat. Remember him, the one with the Barcelloni? He'd be tearin' up the place, rippin' and runnin' around the neighborhood. Always hanging around with _____ and the gang." An instructor continued, "Now look at him. He is a changed man. He smiles now. You would never see a smile on his face before. His hair is cut, he dresses well, speaks politely, and he's calmed down. He has truly matured. He's at _____ (a community college) and he wants to be a mechanial engineer. They say he's got the mathematical aptitude to do it too. We're happy with the change we've seen in him. It's beautiful!"

Peer groups are very important to interns, both before and after they enter the program. In the feeder schools, peer groups represent strong negative influences. "Hanging out," smoking pot, and belonging to gangs are "cool." Going to classes and doing homework are uncool. The "in" group applies a lot of pressure to engage in cool activities and avoid uncool ones. Young people who want to make something of themselves often find they have no other choice but to drop out of school in order to escape from these negative peer pressures.

There is also peer pressure at the CIP, but it is in the opposite direction. There are pressures to dress properly, to attend classes, to be punctual, etc. During the start-up phase of the four replication CIPs, there were no "old" interns to help make the program work. With each subsequent cohort, however, this influence became more prominent. In a mature site, peer pressure is appropriately regarded as a key program component.

It is, of course, not only peer pressure that makes the CIP work. The structure of the program, its rules and regulations, its caring atmosphere, the availability of academic and personal counseling, the infusion of relevant content into academic materials, exposure to the world of work, and many other elements all contribute. It is the total experience, with each piece playing a significant part, that causes interns to change their lives.

For interns who enter the CIP with fairly high motivation levels, the program itself is "robust." That is to say, one or more program components could be functioning poorly or not at all without causing these interns to drop out. Such interns are able to tolerate a substantially less-than-ideal CIP environment while continuing to benefit from those program components that are in place and functioning. If there were no CIP, these individuals would probably find some other way to attain their academic and career-preparation objectives.

Interns with substantially less motivation also enter the CIP. For them, the issue of whether or not to remain in the program is quite delicate. Climate is a particularly critical feature. Events that, for example, lower staff morale are often sufficient to drive them away. All components have to be functioning smoothly in order to retain these interns long enough to build their motivation up to a point where they can tolerate imperfect program implementation.

Most of the CIP interns have motivation levels that fall between these two extremes. The more highly motivated they are, the more likely they are to persist in the face of adversity. The most dramatic CIP successes, however, are those whose initial commitment to the program was the most tenuous. To succeed with such individuals, a very high level of implementation is required.

In summary, the CIP features that appear responsible for the achievement and self-esteem benefits that accrue to interns are the program's core components: instruction, counseling, Hands-On, Intern Formalized Assessment, and climate. Most of these operate in a fairly direct way, but climate functions as a catalyst which motivates the interns, inclines them to attend classes and adhere to codes of dress and behavior, and enables the other core components to work.

Part of the program's climate is an outgrowth of the support subsystem which encompasses program rules and regulations, personnel roles and qualifications, curriculum, facilities, funds, materials, and supplies. Deficiencies in any of these areas is likely to have a negative effect on program climate and thus on overall operations.

In a sense, the CIP's ideological subsystem (which is also OIC's) drives the other two subsystems. Staff who embrace the ideology do care about the interns, will set high (although realistic) expectations for them, will deal with the whole person, and will provide behavioral models for the interns to follow. A critical ingredient in bringing all of this about, however, is good leadership in key management roles (the director and the instructional supervisor) and professional competence in all staff positions.

Not all elements of the program have to be operating perfectly for interns to benefit substantially from their participation. It must be remembered, however, that the program serves young people whose needs could not be met by the regular school and who, for the most part, have been "turned off" by the system. Retrieving them is a delicate operation. It is beyond the capabilities of a perfectly functioning CIP in the case of many youths who are simply too far gone. Others, who are borderline cases, can be lost with the slightest miscue. Most components have to be functioning at least moderately well or the program will end up serving only those youths whose chances of "making it" would have been reasonably good even without the CIP.

Task D. Comparisons of the CIP with Other Youth Programs

The single Task D question was, "How does the CIP approach compare in effectiveness, feasibility, impact, and factors important for policy with other approaches undergoing comparable evaluations, to helping the population to be served through the Youth Employment Act?" (RFP NIE-R-78-0004, p. 20). In attempting to deal with this question, three separate analyses were undertaken, one addressed to implementation issues, one addressed to "treatments" and outcomes, and the third addressed to costs.

The implementation analysis was confined to ongoing youth programs funded under the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977 (YEDPA, Public Law 95-93). One of its most salient findings was that all of these programs were under-subscribed and that absenteeism and attrition were high among those who did enroll. While the target groups are very large, enrollments fell well below even the most pessimistic projections. As suggested in the discussion under Task C, before young people can be attracted to such programs, they must decide that they want to change their lives. Unless they have made such a decision, they are likely to attend only sporadically and to drop out before long.

There are differences among programs in terms of their ability to attract and retain participants. Out-of-school youths are not attracted by programs that require their return to traditional high schools. Their experience with the public schools has been negative and they are more interested in alternative educational settings, particularly those that offer individulized attention. On the other hand, out-of-school youths are interested in joining programs that allow them to engage in concrete, individually tailored work experiences.

Among youths currently attending school, there is a willingness to remain in school when offered a stipend, but for some of them, attending an alternative school setting, even if not remunerated, is much more attractive.

Because of the apparent hierarchy in preferences, it seems that programs that (a) offer either a good match of jobs to interests or an alternative academic environment, (b) provide a host of auxiliary services, and (c) offer a financial incentive, have more appeal than programs that do not incorporate these features. The various YEDPA programs have implemented the "work experience" concept in different ways. Matching jobs to youth interests appears to be one way to make work experiences meaningful and to increase the drawing and holding power of programs.

In general, programs seeking to serve large numbers of youths have been less successful in providing work experiences carefully matched to youths' preferences. On the other hand, large programs that include broad community participation do seem capable of providing youths with more satisfactory and satisfying work experiences. Many of the more successful work experiences, however, were preceded by training in work attitudes and basic skills.

The participation of private, and particularly profit-making firms, in the provision of work experiences remains an elusive objective. Despite the wage subsidies present in some programs, relatively few private businesses have made job opportunities available. On the other hand, programs run either by CBOs or by groups with broad community representation seem capable of securing the support of private-sector employers.

The YEDPA programs included in this analysis represented three different institutional arrangements: (a) an alternative educational agency, (b) an approach based on broad community participation, and (c) the use of the regular public school in conjunction with existing manpower agencies and other government units. Findings reveal that, while all three institutional arrangements are possible, programs with well developed community networks (i.e., those affiliated with CBOs) tend to perform better in gaining access to disadvantaged youths (particularly those who are out of school) and in securing the cooperation of business firms in the community.

The performance of prime sponsors in gaining access to the neediest youths and in providing "meaningful" work experiences has been rather poor. On the other hand, the YEDPA experience has shown that the indirect networks through which some CBOs operate permit them to identify employers in the community and to convince them of the need to help youths. In the implementation of YEDPA programs--which were characterized by a short duration--the issue of credibility was critical because there was no time to develop it. CBOs, having their credibility already established, were able to outperform most prime sponsors.

Other findings that emerged from the implementation analysis of YEDPA programs include:

- Different approaches are required for recruiting out-of-school and in-school youths. Recruitment of out-of-school youths is labor-intensive and demands personal contact with them. Gaining access is facilitated when recruiter and recruit come from the same community and socioeconomic background. This finding suggests that CBOs have some potential advantages over other types of agencies.

- The commitment of target youths to YEDPA programs is usually fragile. Eligibility requirements and entrance tests--although intended to assure that the youths served are indeed members of the target population--have the negative effect of deterring substantial numbers from participation.

- Targeting programs on poor, low-achieving students has the unanticipated effect of giving the program a social stigma that dissuades needy youths from participating. To avoid the stigma currently associated with these programs, policy makers should open participation to a wider range of students, including youths who are gifted, talented, and with incomes above the poverty level. At present, most YEDPA programs are instances of socioeconomic and racial segregation.

- Adequate incentives need to be developed to secure the participation of private, for-profit firms in providing work experiences. Wage subsidies are not sufficient to obtain the collaboration of many commercial and industrial firms.

The part of Task D that focused on program treatments and outcomes examined five alternative high schools that were similar in most respects to the CIP. While these five programs resembled the CIP, features such as operating under the jurisdiction of the LEA, offering stipends or paid work experience, and providing specific skills training and child care services clearly distinguished them from the CIP. Also, four of the programs had been in existence much longer than the CIP (two had existed for as long as seven years).

The features of each program were examined in terms of their inferred effect on five outcome measures: enrollment, attendance, retention, graduation, and placement. In terms of achieving enrollment objectives, the most relevent factors appeared to be a good reputation in the community, an intake schedule that was coordinated with the regular high school, a good (non-threatening) working relationship with the LEA, a catchment area with a large enough pool of potential program enrollees, a location in which there were not many other programs competing for the same students, and reasonably stable funding. The CIP was at some disadvantage during its first years' operation in that it did not have enough time to establish itself in the community. It also experienced the presence of competing alternative programs and fell under the threat of discontinued funding on more than one occasion. However, once it became stable, it was able to meet its enrollment objectives.

The CIP and all five comparison programs had difficulty maintaining high attendance levels. However, projects that provided incentives such as child care, paid work, and transportation had more success in getting students to attend the program. The findings also point clearly to the fact that school attendance is improved by firm attendance policies. A caring staff and daily follow-up of absent students are two other factors that appear helpful in maintaning acceptable attendance levels. Attendance is also improved when strong connections are made between graduation and attendance, and when unexcused absences are grounds for termination.

The CIP and the comparison programs also experienced substantial difficulty in retaining students. Programs which served primarily dropouts were at a particular disadvantage compared to programs serving a majority of potential dropouts. The data also indicated that, while strict attendance policies increased attendance, they decreased retention. Also, programs offering part-time work had less success in retaining students since the students often were offered (and accepted) full-time employment as a result of their part-time jobs.

The graduation findings indicated that, not surprisingly, programs offering GEDs had more success "graduating" students than the CIP and other programs offering regular high school diplomas. The main factor accounting for this difference appeared to be the accelerated nature of GED programs. Also, these programs did not have to conform to state or LEA curriculum requirements.

In regard to the fifth and final outcome, placement, the findings indicated that the CIP had an advantage over most of the comparison programs in placing graduates in college, but in terms of job placements, the comparison programs appeared to have the advantage (although job quality was not reflected in the data). This finding, it should be noted, is consistent with the CIP's academic orientation. It is not a job training program.

There was no difference between GED and other high school diploma programs in terms of job placements. The kinds of linkages that are made with the college and business community, the job or college orientation of the programs, and the availability of employment in the area are factors that are related to the differences in college and job placements and tend to obscure relationships between types of programs and types of placements. No data were available on the quality of job placements, but one suspects that youth with diplomas may have been able to obtain more satisfying and meaningful work than those with GEDs.

It was concluded that the CIP might significantly enhance its performance in the attendance area by adopting stronger sanctions relative to unexcused absences. The adoption of a skills training component would also probably improve both attendance and job placement. It was felt, however, that doing so would have the counterbalancing effects of diminishing the academic effectiveness of the program and reducing the number of college placements.

In all of the other outcome areas, it appeared that the CIP was doing as well as or better than the comparison programs or at least that it would when it attained the same level of maturity.

Costs

Volume III of the Task D report (Klibanoff, 1981) presented an analysis of CIP costs derived from a resource-usage perspective. The per-site acquisition (start-up) costs were estimated at $76,775 or $510 per intern under the assumption that these costs are spread over 150 interns. The cost of operating the program was estimated to be $524,875 per site per year, or $3500 per intern (again assuming that 150 interns were served). The per-intern costs would drop to $2625 if the CIP were to serve 200 interns per year. A breakdown of costs by catagory is presented in Table 5.

No rigorous comparisons of these costs with the costs of other programs were attempted. "Modest" comparisons (modest because the costs of the other programs were provided by the programs rather than derived from analysis of resource usage), however, were drawn between the CIP and a "typical" public high school. The cost per typical high school student is $2400--only 8.6% lower than the CIP cost when 200 interns are served.

Table 5

Program Cost on a Per-Intern Basis for Three Levels of Program Size

Program Cost Category	150 Interns	175 Interns	200 Interns
Acquisition Cost			
Facilities (furnish/remodel)	$ 190	160	140
Equipment Purchase	95	80	70
Materials	135	115	100
Pre-Service Training	95	85	70
Total Acquisition Cost:	510[a]	440[a]	385[a]
Operating Cost			
Facilities (rent, utilities, insurance, maintenance and replacement of furnishings, upkeep)	310	265	230
Personnel	2,825	2,425	2,120
Staff Development	50	40	35
Equipment (replacement/maintenance)	20	15	15
Materials (replacement)	25	25	20
Intern Services (Hands-On, etc.)	130	110	95
Other Services (communications, reproduction)	75	65	60
Other Costs (travel, computer, consultants)	65	55	50
Total Operating Cost:	3,500	3,000	2,625
Total First Year Cost:	4,010	3,440	3,010
Subsequent Years' Cost:	3,500	3,000	2,625

Note: All values are rounded to nearest $5. Does not include costs of program development, evaluation, or the demonstration contractor costs.

[a] Total per-intern costs are derived by dividing total cost by the appropriate number of interns. The result may not equal the sum of the individual item per-intern costs.

Another modest comparison was drawn between the CIP and several other federally funded youth programs. While these programs differ substantially from the CIP in method, they are directed at the same target group and have the same general objectives of reducing youth unemployment. The per-participant costs of these programs for one year are as follows: CETA Title II-D, $10,049; Summer Youth, $5,132; Job Corps, $13,383; YETP, $5,307; and CETA Title VI, $10,194.

The reader is cautioned that many assumptions underly all these cost estimates. They are far less precise than they appear to be. Futhermore, especialy in cases where cash transfers to participants are involved, comparisons to the CIP may be quite misleading. Nevertheless, they do provide a dollar context within which CIP costs can be better understood. As suggested by Klibanoff, it does "appear on the surface that the CIP is cost competitive with these other programs. In fact, by and large they are more expensive than the CIP."

VIII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

It is the opinion of RMC's project staff that the DOL-funded, NIE-managed, OIC/A-implemented demonstration of the Career Intern Program provided convincing evidence that the CIP can be successfully replicated in new sites. Furthermore, we believe that when it is so replicated it continues to have the same kind of positive influences on participating students that were observed at the prototype sites.

It should not be inferred from the above statements that the CIP is easy to transport (it is not) or that benefits will accrue to participating students regardless of how the program is implemented. All of the four replication sites experienced many problems in getting the CIP up and running. Only two of them attained full implementation with all of the components in place and operating smoothly over an extended period. One additional site attained nearly full implementation. The fourth had a troubled history except for a few months near the beginning of the demonstration period.

When the CIPs were operating well, attendance and retention were high, both interns and staff expressed positive feelings about the program, and there was evidence that program goals were being met. There were many times, however, when all was not well. At those times attendance was sporadic, morale was low, and turnover of both staff and interns was high. Only the most highly motivated interns remained in the program. Those whose commitments to the program and to mainstream America were more tenuous tended to drift away.

To keep a proper perspective on the successes and shortfalls of the CIP it must be remembered that the program serves a very difficult target group. Approximately half the CIP enrollees had previously dropped out of school. Many had been out for a year or more. All of them were turned off by the system and, in quite a few cases, their rejection of dominant social values and codes of behavior was almost complete. What fragile ties remained had to be carefully nurtured. Any breakdown in communication, loss of trust, or perceived lack of caring was enough to send these interns back to the streets.

Start-up activities at the very beginning of the CIP replication effort were critical. Both OIC/A and the local OICs played very important roles in the initial hiring and training of staff, the locating and refurbishing of a suitable facility, and the creation of linkages from the CIP to the local school district and the business community. It is not clear that these activities could have been carried off successfully in the absence of either the central guidance provided by OIC/A or the strong base of community support provided by the local OICs.

After start-up, the role played by OIC/A decreased in importance and the success of the CIPs began to depend more heavily on the programs' own internal leadership. A strong and competent director was clearly a prerequisite as evidenced by the fact that sites without adequate direction invariably foundered. The accessibility of the director to both staff and interns also appeared important. In the two instances where there was either an official, or a de facto program manager separating the director from the rest of the staff, communications broke down and resentment proliferated.

Technical competence is required in all staff positions if the CIP is to meet its objectives. An equally, or perhaps, more important staff qualification is a genuine caring for the interns and understanding of their problems. The caring attitude, however, must be coupled with high expectations of the interns and firmness in enforcing the CIP's codes of dress and behavior. The interns realize that they must learn and abide by the norms of the world-of-work. Therefore, they perceive excessive leniency on the part of the staff as a manifestation of not caring.

The CIP replications were hampered by a series of less-than-ideal circumstances. Too little time was allowed for planning and start-up activities. The timing was also unfortunate, with recruitment of both staff and first-cohort students occurring in the middle of the regular school year. Given these circumstances, it was unreasonable to expect that the programs would be in place and running smoothly on a schedule that, because of unforseen delays in getting contracts awarded, was several months shorter than had originally been planned.

The federal actors were ultimately forced to allow schedules to slip and to reduce early enrollment quotas. They did this, however, without any acknowledgement that the original expectations had been unrealistic. In fact, the sites and OIC/A were led to believe that they had, in essence, failed. As a result, staff morale decreased significantly and feelings of antagonism developed among the sites, OIC/A, and the federal actors. These feelings did little to improve the implementation effort.

A fact which was not adequately understood early in the demonstration period was the CIPs' dependence on "old" and/or former interns for both the recruiting of new interns and for their socialization with respect to program norms. One of the greatest aids to recruitment is word-of-mouth "advertising" in the form of positive comments from satisfied participants. Enrolling in the program before any such recommendations are available requires a more venturesome or more highly motivated individual than after it has passed an initial test.

Similarly, interns who have remained in the program for more than one semester have made some sort of commitment to it. Thus, when new interns break the rules, the "old" interns apply pressure to bring them back in line. In this manner, once the CIP becomes established, there are important forces that tend to maintain it. Clearly, however, no such forces are at work when the program first begins to operate. As a result, it is much more difficult to achieve high levels of attendance and retention.

Once start-up problems were overcome, Site B (the only site that began with a well qualified director) quickly achieved full implementation and operated in an exemplary fashion until the director resigned. Site D also achieved full implementation after a well qualified director was hired. That site continued to function well until the end of the demonstration period. Both Sites B and D were successful in effecting major changes in the lives of several individuals who would, without the program, almost certainly have been lost to society. In addition, both programs helped many other youths earn their high school diplomas and make significant progress toward meaningful, productive careers.

Site C had a history that paralleled that of Site D. Its replacement director might not have been quite as effective as the one at Site D, but she definitely turned the program around. On the other hand, the assumption by the instructional supervisor of management responsibilities beyond those called for in the CIP model had a negative influence. Nevertheless, the program attained nearly full implementation and was still improving at the time the director announced her resignation. Despite its slow start and the temporary loss of momentum near the end of the demonstration period, Site C was also successful in helping many young people attain goals we believe could not have been attained without the CIP.

Site A got off to a good start but suffered increasingly from personnel problems as time passed. The original director was less than ideally qualified for her job, but with better staff support could have achieved substantially more than she did. It was never clear whether her failure to remove the negative influences from the staff resulted from a lack of decisiveness or from the local OIC's reluctance to grant her more autonomy. Perhaps both factors were influential. In any case, the parade of directors who succeeded her were unable to turn the situation around. In fact, the program appeared to suffer a gradual but relentless decline in effectiveness as time passed.

Considering all that was learned in the demonstration, RMC would recommend few changes to the CIP design after which the replications were modeled. All of the sites, however, suffered excessive rates of voluntary staff turnover. While some of the causes of this turnover can be traced to the fact that a two-year demonstration does not offer much job security, low salaries and minimal vacation periods were certainly contributing factors. Should the CIP become an operational model, we would recommend a salary scale that is competitive with that of the local school district. We believe that the resulting increase in costs would leave the CIP within "the competitive range." In fact, even with higher costs, we believe that the CIP would be as cost-effective as any program serving a similar target group.

Modifications are also needed to the summer program. While too little information is available to decide upon an optimum approach, it seems that a half day of academics--which would give the interns a half day (at least) to earn some money--would be a step in the right direction. Help in finding work near to the program would help to solve a non-trivial transportation problem.

A final area in which we believe improvement is possible is sanctions for unexcused absences. The CIP has sanctions--although, at times, enforcement was somewhat lax during the demonstration. Nevertheless, other programs had more severe sanctions--and they seemed to work. In line with the observation that leniency is viewed by interns as a form of not caring, we would recommend that more severe sanctions be imposed on unexcused absences.

In conjunction with Task D (comparison of the CIP with other similar programs), we observed that attendance was higher at programs that had skill training components. We do not recommend that skill training be made a part of the CIP.

Different programs have different goals and serve different target populations. It does not seem reasonable to expect one program to accomplish all goals or to serve all youth. The CIP has a strong academic orientation. It places many of its graduates in college and aims to place non-college-bound graduates in careers rather than jobs. In the words of a former U.S. Commissioner of Education: "I cannot emphasize strongly enough that this is not simply more vocational education for Blacks, something that has properly been attacked in the past as tending to segregate Blacks into semi-skilled occupations, reserving college for the white middle class" (Marland, 1972).

While not all disadvantaged and alienated young people can benefit from the CIP's academic orientation or should go in this direction, a certain percentage can and should. This is the group the CIP is designed to serve. In our opinion, it serves them well.

With respect to the demonstration itself, RMC believes that both program implementation and outcomes would have been substantially enhanced had more reasonable timelines been established. Unrealistic expectations regarding enrollment quotas, the establishment of working relationships with LEAs, and other implementation tasks also seriously detracted from the success of the demonstration. Finally, the intrusive evaluation contributed to the distress of staff and community alike. The control group requirement was felt to be particularly noxious and it is not at all clear that its contribution (if any) to scientific credibility was worth the heavy toll it took in terms of staff morale, recruitment difficulty, and community resentment.

Despite these various problems, the demonstration was successful in confirming that the CIP is a replicable program and that when transported to new sites, it continues to be a powerful force in reshaping the lives of disadvantaged and alienated youths.

References

Campbell, D. T., & Boruch, R. F. Making the case for randomized assignment to treatments by considering the alternatives: Six ways in which quasi-experimental evaluations in compensatory education tend to underestimate effects. In C. A. Bennett & A. A. Lumsdaine (Eds.), Evaluation and experiments: Some critical issues in assessing social programs. New York: Academic Press, 1975.

Coopersmith, S. The antecedents of self-esteem. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman & Co., 1967.

Fetterman, D. M. Study of the Career Intern Program: Final Technical Report--Task C: Program dynamics: Structure, function, and interrelationships. Mountain View, CA: RMC Research Corporation, 1981.

Foat, C. M. Study of the Career Intern Program: Final Report Task D, Vol. 2: Comparisons of the CIP with other similar youth programs. Mountain View, CA: RMC Research Corporation, 1981.

Gibboney Associates, Inc. The Career Intern Program: Final report, Volumes I and II. Blue Bell PA: Author, 1977. (NIE Papers in Education and Work)

Klibanoff, L. S. Study of the Career Intern Program: Final Report Task D, Vol. 3: A cost analysis of the CIP. Mountain View, CA: RMC Research Corporation, 1981.

Marland, S. P. (As quoted in) The Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, October 5, 1972.

Rotter, J. B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80, No. 609

Stromquist, N. P. Study of the Career Intern Program: Final Report Task D, Vol. 1: A comparison of implementation issues in YEDPA programs. Mountain View, CA: RMC Research Corporation, 1981.

Super, D. E. Career development. In J. R. Davitz & S. Ball (Eds.), Psychology of the educational process. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Tallmadge, G. K. An empirical assessment of norm-referenced evaluation methodology. Journal of Educational Measurement, 1981, in press.

Tallmadge, G. K., & Yuen, S. D. Study of the Career Intern Program: Final technical report--Task B: Assessment of intern outcomes. Mountain View, CA: RMC Research Corporation, 1981. [UR 462]

Treadway, P. G., Stromquist, N. P., Fetterman, D. M., Foat, C. M., & Tallmadge, G. K. Study of the Career Intern Program: Final report Task A: Implementation. Mountain View, CA: RMC Research Corporation, 1981. [UR 464]